Theological Magazine

OF THE

EVANGELICAL SYNOD OF NORTH AMERICA

Volume 62 March, 1934 Number 2

Motto: 1. Cor. 3, 22-23.
Πάντα ὑμῶν ἐστίν, ὑμεῖς δὲ Χριστοῦ.

PACIFIC LUTHERAN
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
LIBRARY

Published bi-monthly and entered at the post office at Saint Louis, Missouri, as second-class matter in December, 1898.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in section 1103, Act of October, 1917, authorized on July 3, 1918.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Church Service and Sunday School, A. A. Susott	81
Preaching for the Times, J. O. Reller	89
Shakespeare and the Bible, Dr. H. J. Schick	93
Schleiermacher's Ethical Theory, Elmer Arndt	101
Lage in der Religionspädagogik. Dr. H. Werdermann	107
Schleiermachers Todestag. Dr. C. Schieler †	116
Editorials	126
Christian World	134
Book Review	147

Theological Magazine

of the

Evangelical Synod of North America.

Published by the Evangelical Synod of North America. Price per copy (six numbers) $2.00; to foreign countries, $2.20. Rev. H. Kamphausen, Dr. theol. (Giessen Univ.), 1956 W. Boulevard, Cleveland, Ohio, Editor.

All communications relating to editorial work, all contributions and exchanges must be addressed to the editor.

All communications relating to business matters must be addressed to Eden Publishing House, 1712-24 Chouteau Ave., St. Louis, Missouri.

Volume 62 St. Louis, Mo. March 1, 1934

THE CHURCH SERVICE AND/OR THE SUNDAY SCHOOL

A. A. Susott

It is said that one of the New England ministers, in the early days of the Sunday School, shook his cane at the place where a young lady was meeting with a class and said: "You imps of Satan, doing the devil's work!" A certain amount of that antagonism has carried over from that time to this, and with it a certain spirit of independence on the part of the Sunday School which makes it often an organization existing by the side of the church, rather than a part of the church. The minister of a church has comparatively little to say concerning the work of the Sunday School, but the superintendent of the Sunday School is often enough a man of such prominence that he feels it his duty and privilege to dictate to the minister. During the past three decades the Sunday School attendance has grown by leaps and bounds, while attendance at church service has been gradually diminishing. No wonder there are ministers who look upon the Sunday School as a liability rather than an asset, as a detriment to the work of the church rather than a help.

Two mutually independent organizations cannot exist along side of each other, occupying the same building, attempting to do similar work without finally conflicting with each other. When the Sunday School concerned itself almost wholly with children, the problem did not exist as it exists today when the adult department of the Sunday School is inclined to predominate. The combined programs of the church service and the Sunday School hour ordinarily occupy from two and one half to three hours. The latter

is then given the preference by those who do not care to remain for the full time. Especially is this true if there are children in the family, for the Sunday School is making a valiant endeavor to do one thing: to meet, in some form, the needs of each particular age group. This, more than anything else, is the secret of its success.

It is, however, rather embarrassing to the minister to see between five and six hundred people in Sunday School and only about two hundred of this number in the church service. The first reaction is one of dissatisfaction with the people. Surely the church service is the main item of the Sunday morning program! This fact is stressed, the people are admonished, at first gently, then more severely. Yet all in vain, the people continue to drift away. Perhaps the church service itself is changed so as to become "more interesting", perhaps the minister will spend more time with his sermons, yet nothing seems to help much. Various schemes are tried, the Sunday School teachers are urged to be present and bring their classes. Finally, the people themselves begin to think that perhaps there is something wrong with the minister, since he stresses church attendance and yet has so few people in the service. Nearly every minister can write the concluding chapter.

Various attempts are being made to overcome the separation between the two services. In some instances combined services are being held. The Sunday School opens with two or three songs and a prayer, with the class session immediately following. Then the entire group attends the worship service in the church. Perhaps there will be a special sermon for children, after which they will be dismissed while the adults listen to another sermon especially for them. Naturally, provision must be made for children's classes or activities during the remaining period, else the parents must take their children home. This plan, with certain modifications, is being used in a number of places. On the whole, it is the most promising, and gives an excellent opportunity for more teaching in religion than would be possible in the single hour usually devoted to Sunday School. It is virtually a three period program—classes, worship, then a divided program: for the children, class work of some kind; for the adults, a sermon. One of the draw backs is the disturbance of children leaving the church service at the close of their period.

Perhaps the chief objection to such a plan is the fact that adults, young people, and children have considerable difficulty in using and benefitting by the same worship program. Therefore, some churches have a special service, or perhaps two or three different worship services during the same hour. And in a short time

the whole program is back to where it started from—a sparate Sunday School and church service. Therefore another scheme has lately evolved, that of dispensing with Sunday School for all those of intermediate age on up. There you restore to the Sunday School its original function of being a school for children, while the church is for adults. Even if the Sunday School lesson is preached about by the pastor, it still is a church service rather than a Sunday School hour. In other words, the Sunday School is deprived of all those over a certain age—which may for a while minister to the preacher's sense of importance, but may have unpleasant repercussions as time goes on.

For the fact remains, the appeal of the Sunday School is one, the appeal of the church service is another. The person who enjoys going to Sunday School may be bored almost to tears by the church service. And the person who enjoys the church service may find absolutely no satisfaction in the Sunday School. Most people like both, with a little stronger leaning to one or the other. It would seem a nearly fatal mistake to curtail one program in order to further the other. Probably the time will never come when one completely displaces the other. The two services will undoubtedly go on side by side for many years to come, both ministering to specific needs in very similar ways. The church service is a more formal, ritualistic, stately service that exerts an appeal that can never be a part of the Sunday School. But the Sunday School offers a type of fellowship and a method of teaching that cannot be duplicated in the church service. To make the most of both is the problem which confronts us today.

The whole problem of Christian education is one that needs far more study on the part of ministers. There may have been a time when the primary duty of a minister was to conduct the Sunday morning service in such a way that people were helped spiritually. Some ministers of today are putting the chief emphasis on visiting, and attendance at services shows that their efforts are not altogether in vain. But in many instances the minister is looked upon as a man who is supposed to minister to the importance of the members of the church. And all too often the minister succumbs to this subtle temptation, and as he does this successfully, his prestige grows. But in too many instances he is not really developing a Christian spirit, a Christian attitude toward life; his church becomes more of a club than an organization to further the development of Christian ideals and life. The minister himself is flattered or depressed according to the number of people who attend his church service. This is only one of the marks of a really successful ministry, and it is not by any means the most significant.

It is not without reason that the minister is accused of being lukewarm toward Christian education. In recent years a whole new field has opened up in this important branch of the church's work, yet few ministers are really aware of the changes going on in the whole realm of education and especially in the field of religious education. Perhaps we should not judge ourselves too harshly—after all, our professors prepared us for everything but that. And even today religious education is compelled to fight for every little bit of recognition that it finally receives. Religious educators are looked upon as a peculiar breed of men who must of necessity stand apart from the congregational life. It should not be so; the minister is an educator, and he should be a Christian educator. The whole of his ministry depends upon his success as a religious educator, no matter what means or method he might prefer to use or be especially qualified to use.

This subject of religious education grows upon nearer acquaintance to one of well-nigh colossal proportions. In a recent "partial" bibliography on the subject of "Character Education", over five hundred books and important articles are mentioned. This is just one aspect of the field. The day is past and done when the man who read two or three books on Sunday School materials and methods could pose as an "authority". Yet no minister could possibly hope to cover the entire field, nor need he do so in order to put on an effective program of religious education in his own church. He can and should understand the principles that are being used today; he can avail himself of materials that help him to understand the underlying philosophy, and from that and his previous experience and training he will be able to build a fairly effective program in the local church. It does take study, it does take thought, and above all else it requires a mind that is open to the essentials of a program without necessarily being tied to a specific method. Magazines like the "International Journal of Religious Education" are valuable in that they give ideas and tell how others are carrying them out. In such a magazine, too, can be found reviews of books which may be useful.

But when the minister has equipped himself, the trouble is not ended, it usually begins. Not one out of a hundred Sunday School superintendents are qualified for the job, the only ones who will admit inefficiency are those who are most able! Most of the others hold their job by virtue of personal attractiveness, or friendship with the "powers that be" in most congregations—and which make it exceedingly uncomfortable for the minister if he dares so much as to suggest a possible change in the existing order of things. In too many instances the minister, the man most thoroughly interested in the work and the best equipped to do it, is compelled to

stand without and mourn at the lack of results. Therefore his ideas dare not be hazy and indefinite; he must be ready with a program that will work and that will commend itself to the thoughful.

The first thing necessary is for the minister *to be given his proper place in the administration of the Sunday School.* There is no reasonable excuse for a separate, independent organization to exist alongside of the church proper. As a rule, the minister has more to say in every other organization than he does in the Sunday School, and most groups cooperate with the minister and with the church. The Sunday School is quite content to be sufficient unto itself, and the minister is very seldom consulted even about the spiritual qualifications of proposed teachers. Instead of being a separate, autonomous body, the Sunday School should be under the active direction of a Board of Religious Education, appointed or elected by the church, the personnel of which the pastor should have a voice in selecting, and of which he himself should be an active member. The business of the Sunday School, including the appointing of teachers, officers and superintendents should be carried on by this group. That would leave the "Teachers' Meeting" free to be a regular "Workers' Conference" in place of a long drawn out discussion of various matters relatively unimportant. It would give the minister an opportunity to give a certain amount of training to his teachers himself, and enable him to plan with others for helpful conferences. He would then be working in the Sunday School, not only by teaching a class or doing certain other work, but through the teachers, the training of whom is his vital concern. There will then be less tendency to feel that the minister is being slighted when the church attendance is less than it should be—through his teachers he is reaching the whole Sunday School group. If he will devote the time necessary to the work, he will find a quick and surprising response on the part of his workers. He may not come to them and expect to hold them spellbound while he dishes out ancient materials—he himself must study and keep on studying; he must be prepared to awaken questions in the minds of his teachers; he must be prepared to face with them real problems of character education.

The second thing that he needs to do is to *develop a real worship program* in the Sunday School. Poor church attendance is due partly to the fact that those who ought to come have never been taught to worship. The Sunday School is still cursed with "opening exercises", the chief feature of which is all too often a song-leader who "whoops it up" and admonishes the school to "raise the roof"! The only type of service that can appeal to one brought up in such an atmosphere is the noisy service usually associated with

some revivals. Perhaps the minister will need to lead a few worship programs himself, which will be dignified without being soporific, and appealing without being merely noisy. But above all else he ought to train his school, especially his young people, in preparing and leading worship programs. In a few years these young people will be his strongest allies in bringing people to church. And the minister can learn a surprising number of things from the young people of today. There is an unsuspected susceptibility in many of them for the deeper things of the spirit. From them he can learn how to make his own sermons hit the mark, how he can deepen and enrich his own worship program. Naturally, they will need guidance in this work; it will mean the outlay of several dollars for suggested worship programs and materials, but this will be more than repaid by increased attendance and interest. In our own church each department superintendent supervises the worship program, or leads it, using pupils in various capacities. All from the Intermediate department on up meet in a common auditorium for worship, each department superintendent taking turns in leading the worship service. As a rule one teacher and his or her class prepares and leads the program on some designated Sunday. Ample time is given them for preparation, and it appears to be an engrossing project for them. Attendance at Sunday School has picked up surprisingly, and, more surprising still, (if it is a surprise!) the church attendance too has grown larger.

The third thing he needs to do is to see that *adequate and satisfactory lesson materials* are being used. Too often the first consideration is one of cost and some cheap quarterly is used the material for which was written or at least adapted from writings of long, long ago. Brethren, did you ever really look these things over? Is your primary material written for the primary, or is it written for adults in words of one syllable? There is a difference! Are your junior materials of such nature that the juniors are helped to better living thereby? Are your young people's materials of a type that stimulate interest, that arouse discussion, that cause a certain desire for the Sunday morning hour when the discussion can be continued? Yes, it even costs money to find the right materials for each group and even in some instances for the individual class, but again, such painstaking survey and careful expenditure will in the end lead to increased understanding, more and larger contributions —if you are at all interested in these last. You have to argue with some people on a purely material plane, and so we ministers sometimes have to find even such arguments in order to convince our Christian business men. Two classes in our church, young people and adults, have chosen text-books entirely unrelated to the rest of the Sunday School curriculum, with the result that the attendance

in these classes has picked up, and one member said to me: "I never knew Christian things could be so interesting!" Those competent to do so will want a certain measure of freedom in selecting material and studying it, and from my own experience I would say it is advisable to let them do so within reason. After all, these lesson series do get rather monotonous after a certain number of repetitions. Again, the minister needs to be well-enough posted in these matters to guide his young people to the proper books or subjects to be studied. They find his judgment good here—and are sooner inclined to rely upon it in other things.

The fourth thing the minister needs in this respect is the *courage of his convictions*. It should be taken for granted that he has worthwhile convictions—then he should not allow himself to be shaken out of them, or even to withdraw them because some one else opposes them—and him. It is surprising how much personal opposition can develop when the minister presents new ideas. The ideas are recognized as being good—so the opposition becomes personal. It is best to forget the personal side of it, and stick to the idea and the ideal. Wisely prepared through sermon and by means of the Workers' Conference, a majority will rally to the aid of the idea and so to the aid of the minister. But he must have courage; the people will not support him if the sound of his trumpet is uncertain, or if he is plainly unsure of himself. He need not be dogmatic, yet he must know his subject and know how to present it. The people are waiting for real leadership, and even if it costs the minister his present position, he will have accomplished a certain work. Paul had to move around a lot because of opposition—but he did his work just the same. A long pastorate is not necessarily a successful pastorate in the highest sense of the word. Our accounting must be made to the Lord of the Church and not to the local church council.

Perhaps an article of this kind should devote several pages to suggested materials, but that might result in this appearing to be an excerpt from our publishing house catalogue. In spite of great temptation to do otherwise, I am going to mention but one book, which is truly a source book and which will do more to give the average minister an understanding and appreciation of the present status of religious education than any other book or series of books that I know of. This book gives a picture of the field as a whole and a very excellent bibliography of the various phases of religious education. The book is "Studies in Religious Education", edited by Lotz and Crawford, published by Cokesbury, and written by twenty-nine outstanding leaders in religious education.

The slogan of the International Convention of Religious Education which met in Toronto, Canada in 1930 was: *"Every Church*

a school in Christian living." Is it? Perhaps it is just a nice little club, where a few well-chosen congenial people meet on Sunday morning and carry on a little religious work so as to secure for themselves and their children a "place in heaven". Or perhaps it is a group, large or small, which meets in desultory fashion and in various ways on different occasions in order not to be considered heathen. Perhaps it is a group that meets because it has nothing else to do. To what extent is the individual minister capitalizing this time which is placed at his disposal in order that he might make his church what it really ought to be—and what he really wants to see it become? Surely our first purpose is not to have a large attendance at church services, or at Sunday School, but rather that we should efficiently serve those who come, in order that they might be able to live fruitfully and joyously, as Christ lived in this world. That means that the whole program of the church must be gone into, and revamped and revitalized until every member has a definite place in the organization and some worth-while task to perform. We of today face the challenge. If we do not leave the beaten and barren paths of merely speculative theology and the unfruitful fields of moral preachments, we will not be developing Christ-like men and women in the world of today. Whether we like it or not, new wine is being poured. The old wineskins will not hold this new wine. The whole structure of the social, economic and political order is changing—and the religious system must change with it. After all, the things we cling to are the methods and techniques which our fathers and mothers found effective;—new methods and techniques do not mean that we have changed religion, or the ideas underlying the church, but only the form. The changing form is another proof of the unchanging content.

"THE PREACHING OUR TIME NEEDS"

J. Otto Reller

Wherever we go today we are confronted with the question, growing out of the total economic situation, "What can be done to bring us back to normalcy again?" By "normalcy" I suppose is meant the prosperous times of a few years ago. Without entering into a consideration of the assumption whether the inflated period of unprecedented prosperity was a normal time, i. e., one best adapted to the sound development of the nation, let us admit that for America, at least, favored as we are by location, climatic conditions, natural resources, energetic youthfulness and practical-mindedness, the present economic stagnation is abnormal. It need not exist. The fact that it does, however, is a sympton that something or some things are out of adjustment. It is the part of wisdom to learn what it is and set it right and thus meet the needs of our people and the world.

As preachers and recognized leaders of the religious forces and institutions of our land, we may believe that our people need to have their moral convictions and their sense of spiritual values reinforced for unless this takes place all material progress and prosperity will prove more of a curse than a blessing.

Inasmuch as the major part of this burden rests upon the Christian ministry as such, and since the office of preaching and teaching is the medium through which for the most part this responsibility is discharged, let us consider

"The Preaching Our Time Needs"

Our time! What shall we say of it? How restless, and baffling and challenging! How it seems to defy our efforts to understand and analyze and minister to it! Notwithstanding let us attempt to point out some of its prominent characteristics. Until we have done that it is useless to speak of fitting our preaching to the needs of the day.

I.

One aspect of our time met on every hand is *WORLDLINESS*. This might be defined in the words of Paul as conformity to the world, "taking pattern after the age in which we live". And to qualify this more fully we mean accepting and living according to the standards of the great mass of average folk.

When we try to locate these standards, we find them in the dominant trends of our day, which regard things of paramount importance. This is the attitude that has obsessed the common mind. It is not progress, invention, the mechanization of industry etc. as such, against which we inveigh but the enslavement of man

by them. We do not wish to turn back the hands of the clock, if we could. Nor can we, even if we would. The mechanical things and their resultant products are the creation of God's great gift of intelligence to man. But there is a right and wrong use of his blessings and our age has gone to excess in its devotion to comforts, prosperity, profits, bigness, etc.

This is, of course, not the first time that this problem has been faced. The early church came squarely up against it and for the first hundred years or more, it exhibited a remarkable attraction in drawing men out of the terribly enervating atmosphere and undergirding them with a heroism and resourcefulness in opposing the secularism of the day. That triumph is still the glory of Christian history. But after the first flush of its pristine spirituality had passed somewhat, we see it developing another technique in its grapple with reality-asceticism. History teaches us that this was not the true antidote for secularism and therefore we will not advocate it in its original or modified forms. We are not to tell our people to flee from the world. Neither in our preaching to the worldly-minded of our day will we advocate the superior attitude, that goes its own way and consigns the world to the devil while it seeks to snatch the individuals here and there as brands from the burning. The solution has been discredited once for all in the implication of the social solidarity of the race. Nor is it adequate to define and delimit certain circumscribed areas of life as our particular responsible province and confine our efforts to that. Rather should we be guided in our preaching to a secular age by our Lord Himself who was in the world and yet not of it and so recognize in our human surroundings, good, bad and imperfect though they be, the opportunity for the discipline of our souls and the growth of character. In a similar way we can and should point out to the various classes, the mothers in the homes, the fathers in business, young people in their recreation and schools, and all other categories the necessity for discrimination in their choices and supplant the passing pleasures in material comforts with the abiding satisfactions of spiritual ideals.

II.

We come now to a second characteristic of our time, which is hardly less general than that of secularism, namely *questioning, doubt, perplexity.* It is little wonder. The time seems "out of joint". Many things which seemed to be settled a generation ago have been brought forth and subjected to a new examination.

We are perplexed in:

a) The economic side of life, the profit motive, distribution of wealth, including even the organization of society;

b) In education, where there is much uncertainty not only as to the methods but even the goal of the whole process;
c) In the region of moral standards including such matters as drinking, marriage and divorce, sex relations, amusements, etc., etc., and
d) most of all in the field of religion on such weighty matters as the authority of the Bible, the impact of science on religion, even the existence of God.

Standards are being questioned, authority is fading and men are wondering where we go from here.

Have we any message for such an age that is uncertain of itself and suffers because of it? Let us dare to believe that we have or the battle is lost before we begin. Before the preacher can mediate to a confused and troubled generation a sense of security, conviction and a better grounded faith in worth-while and abiding things, he must himself first become a clear, clean medium through which the light can pass. In other words there can be no vital message to a floundering age until the preacher is convinced of the reality and urgency of his message. He will not be able to warm shivering souls until he has captured the spiritual glow himself. He must believe in the reality of his call and the sacredness of the thing he is called upon to do before he can convince others.

III.

In the perplexities of our day the third characteristic need has its rise,—*disillusionment.* The same analysis and classification suffices as that above. In the minds of not a few there is a haunting sense of futility in the cherished expectations of a permanent and widely shared prosperity, in the efficacy of education as a means of producing a high type of citizenship, the ready acceptance of peace—ideals and the reform of society by law. Perhaps we have been harboring illusions. Maybe we have taken too easily some untenable positions which we had no right to do. Noble as our social hopes and ideas have been in the form of world peace, abolition of poverty, and racial adjustment, triumph of democracy, enforced sobriety, sufficiency of education, etc.—have we not expected these things to come too quickly and have we not been unwilling to pay the price for them? Have we not erroneously overestimated the essential goodness of human nature and the efficacy of mass movements in the Kellogg Pact and the 18th Amendment? Have we not falsely tied the rewards of the religious life up to worldly things, or been organizing the universe around our own little self?

If this is so, and it seems to be, then the disillusionment of our day, after all, may be a helpful corrective. But it must not be

allowed to develop into cynicism. That would cut the nerve of all further effort. But of this later.

What shall be our approach? Obviously we must embrace anew the long time method of Jesus of paying more attention to the individual while we continue to work for social melioration. It is still true that "the soul of all improvement is the improvement of the soul." We must help folks through our preaching and pastoral ministry to be more discriminating in their choices and help them to make the best of what is left. Show them the place of pain and disappointment in the whole scheme of things, give them the historical perspective, impress upon them that there are no short cuts to the ends we have in view. A wealth of material in the prophets and Gospels is available and excellent for this purpose.

IV.

Finally we must take cognizance of one other factor in the mind of our day to which passing reference was made above—*cynicism*. As suggested, frustration and cynicism are closely related as parent and child. And if unchecked the end is complete indifference, devastating irresponsibility and black despair.

Perhaps this is not the temptation of any great number, but since we are to become all things to all people, we cannot dismiss the individual cases where cynicism sits on the throne. It calls for a sympathetic approach, for the finest kind of sincerity, for a willingness to understand, for the ability to point out overlooked values, to suggest something to believe and do that is still worth believing and doing. Our preaching to be morally creative must be helpfully positive, not negatively denunciatory. Don't become too critical. Suggest constructive measures and when we tell folks in what ways they are wrong and unreasonable be ready to tell them what they should do.

Preaching that our time needs? It will not be easy. It will demand the finest consecration, the broadest insight and illumination, a thorough knowledge of facts and conditions and a radiant unshaken faith in the ultimate victorious emergence of that which the prophets predicted and for which our Lord lived and died.

Ah! who is equal to the task? With men it is impossible but with God all things are possible.

SHAKESPEARE AND THE BIBLE

H. J. Schick, S.T.D.

The plays of Shakespeare have been re-read by the writer with an ever increasing appreciation of their depth of thought, their wealth of illustration, richness and beauty of language, variety and ingenuity of plots. What a master this Shakespeare is! What creative energy he displays! What power and height of imagination! With what consummate skill he groups events and figures, keeping interest sustained until the final denouement!

It would be an interesting study to compare the different characters of Shakespeare's plays, for example, *the men* of Shakespeare, —the detestable King Richard III; the splendid King Henry V; the weak Polonius; the demoralizing Pandarus; the railing Thersites; the roistering Falstaff; the wicked monster, Caliban; the wise and powerful Prospero; the deceitful scoundrel, Proteus; the jealous Othello; the trusting, confiding Valentine; the chivalrous Orlando. What an array of men of all types this Master of the drama depicted!

Of no less interest is a study of the *fools* of Shakespeare. Touchstone in "As you like it"; the poor Fool in "King Lear"; Feste in "Twelfth Night"; the clownish grave-diggers in "Hamlet,"—What frankness, what wisdom and wit Shakespeare placed into the mouths of his fools!

Fascinating is a comparison of the *women* of Shakespeare's plays,—beautiful and modest women like Miranda in "The Tempest"; unselfish women like Cordelia in "King Lear"; unamiable women like Adriana in "The Comedy of Errors"; violent and corrupt women like Tamara in "Titus Andronicus"; scolding women like Katharina in "The Taming of the Shrew"; avenging women like Queen Margaret in "King Richard III"; maternal women like Constance in "King John"; devoted women like Desdemona in "Othello"; unsophisticated women like Ophelia in "Hamlet." With what masterly touch Shakespeare delineates their character, paints their charms, describes their vices, exalts their virtues!

The reader will find in Shakespeare's plays an interesting light thrown upon the beliefs and superstitions, the morals and customs, the conditions in Church and State of Shakespeare's age. It would be of interest also to note the circumstances that helped shape the career and the plays of Shakespeare; the sources of his thought and inspiration; the books, stories, plays and songs that influenced him. Among the books that were instrumental in molding the thoughts of the great Dramatist is the Bible. And this fact should be of paramount interest especially to the ministerial readers of this

magazine. Therefore, setting all other possible interests aside, this article will dwell more fully upon the *influence of the Bible* as reflected in the writings of Shakespeare. In doing so, I acknowledge my debt to Dr. A. H. Strong, Bishop Wordsworth, and others.

The England into which Shakespeare was born was an England that had welcomed the Bible in the vernacular. Shakespeare grew up in "a Bible-saturated atmosphere."

By the time Shakespeare took up his pen, Biblical thought and speech had permeated the life of the country.

There was interest in the Scripture and enthusiasm for it. The Bible was uppermost in the minds of men as a topic of conversation and discussion. It was the one popular book of the day.

Quite naturally the pervasive influence of the Scripture would leave its impress upon the genius and the literature of the time: Consciously or unconsciously, the mood and spirit of the day is reflected. This is very pronounced in Shakespeare. Not merely the spirit of the Scripture fills his mind, but the very wording of Scripture as well. When we come to examine his writings, we find abundant evidence on every hand of his familiarity with the Bible. It is not a casual or accidental knewledge, but rather the knowledge of one who with keen mind had imbibed its truths, and had become familiar with its persons, its scenes and incidents and whose imagination was fired by its life and action, its variety, largeness and power. He seems to think naturally in terms of the Bible. Its tropes and illustrations come fluently to the tip of his pen. So obvious is this that Emerson has said: "Shakespeare leans upon the Bible." The Bible is so interwoven into the writings of Shakespeare, that to take it out would leave a great gap. It is stated that Shakespeare's writings contain *more than twelve hundred references to the Bible.*

Let us note some of the passages which attest Shakespeare's acquaintance with the Bible:—

In *"King Richard II"* when speaking of the Duke of Gloucester's death, the poet refers to the story of Cain and Abel:

> "Which blood, like sacrificing Abel's, cries
> Even from the tongueless caverns of the earth
> To me for justice, and rough chastisement."

Again in *"Hamlet":*

> "O, my offense is rank, it smells to heaven,
> It hath the primal eldest curse upon it—
> A brother's murder"—

The story of Elijah and the ravens, and of Jesus' reference to God's care of the sparrows is found in *"As You Like It":*

> "He that doth the ravens feed,

Yea, providently caters for the sparrow,
Be comfort to my age."—

Pilate's washing of his hands in the Judgment hall as he condemns Jesus to be crucified is reflected again in *"King Richard II"*:

"Tho' some of you with Pilate wash your hands,
Showing an outward pity; yet you Pilates
Have delivered me to my sour cross,
And water cannot wash away your sin."

The story of Jacob and Laban is told by Shylock in defense of his tactics in *"The Merchant of Venice"* (1: 3). Beginning with the lines:—"When Jacob grazed his uncle Laban's sheep," the poet, in a score of lines has Shylock relate the business acumen of Jacob and close with the words:—

"This was a way to thrive, and he was blest."

Quite naturally we would expect that the story of the redemption would find frequent expression in Shakespeare. Such is, indeed, the case. In "Henry IV" (1: 1) we have in a few lines the personality, the environment, the redemptive work, and the sorrow of the Christ:

"In those holy fields,
Over whose acres walk'd those blessed feet,
Which fourteen hundred years ago were nail'd
For our advantage, on the bitter cross."

In "King Richard III" (1: 4), Clarence in the Tower adjures his murderers:

"I charge you, as you hope to have redemption
By Christ's dear blood, shed for our grievous sins,
That you depart, and lay no hands on me."

In "King Henry VI" (II 1: 1), Salisbury swears,

"Now by the death of Him that died for all."

There are as many as eight different instances where Shakespeare makes use of the story of Cain and Abel. The parable of the Prodigal Son is used in five plays. The Creation, the temptation, the fall, the flood, the patriarchs, Job, Pharaoh, Samson, David, Nebuchadnezzar, Jesus, and his disciples, and many others figure in his pages.

The following list shows the variety and number of Bible characters and where they are found in Shakespeare's plays.

BIBLE CHARACTERS

Adam. I Hen. IV. 2: 4 and 3: 3. Hen. V. 1: 1. II Hen. VI. 4: 2. Ham. 5: 1. Love's Labor 4: 2; 5: 2. Much Ado. 2: 1 (twice). Rich. II 3: 4. As You Like It. 2: 1. Com. of Err. 4: 3.

Eve. Love's Labor 1: 1; 5: 2. Rich. III. 3: 4. Twelfth Night 1: 5. Two Gent. 3: 1. Merry Wives 4: 2. Sonnet 93.

Abel. Rich. II. 1: 1. I Hen. VI. 1: 3.
Cain. I Hen. VI. 1: 3. II Hen. IV. 1: 1. Ham. 5: 1; 3: 3. Rich. II. 5: 6. K. John 3: 4. Love's Labor 4: 2.
Noah. Com. of Err. 3: 2. Twelfth Night 3: 2.
Japheth. II Hen. IV. 2: 2.
Abraham. Mer. of Ven. 1: 2; 1: 3. Rich. II. 4: 1. Rich. III. 4: 3.
Hagar. Mer. of Ven. 2: 5.
Jacob. Mer. of Ven. 1: 2 (five times); 2: 5.
Laban. Mer. of Ven. 1: 3 (twice).
Pharaoh. I Hen. IV. 2: 4.
Pharaoh's Soldiers. Much Ado. 3: 3.
Joshua. Love's Labor 5: 1.
Deborah. I Hen. VI. 1: 2.
Jephthah and his daughter. Ham. 2: 2 (twice). III Hen. VI. 5: 1.
Samson. I Hen. VI. 1: 2. Hen. VIII. 5: 3. Love's Labor 1: 2 (five times).
Goliath. Merry Wives 5: 1. I Hen. VI. 1: 2.
Jezebel. Twelfth Night 2: 5.
Job and Job's Wife. Merry Wives 5: 5. I Hen. IV. 1: 2.
Solomon. Love's Labor 1: 2 and 4: 3.
Sheba (Saba). Hen. VIII. 5: 4.
Daniel. Mer. of Ven. 4: 1. (three times).
Nebuchadnezzar. All's Well 4: 5.
Jesus. Rich. III 5: 3. III Hen. VI. 5: 6.
Christ (Master). Rich. II. 4: 1. Rich. III. 1: 4. II Hen. VI. 5: 1. I Hen. IV. 1: 1; 3: 2. Hen. V. 4: 1. I Hen. VI. 1: 2.
Mary (Mother of Jesus). Rich. II. 2: 1. Hen. VIII. 5: 1. I Hen. VI. 1: 2.
Herod. Hen. V. 3: 3. Ham. 3: 2. Merry Wives 2: 1. Ant. and Cleo. 1: 2; 3: 3; 4: 6.
The Nazarite. Mer. of Venice 1: 3.
Twelve Apostles. Rich. II. 4: 1.
Judas. Rich. II. 3: 2; 4: 1. III Hen. VI. 5: 7. Love's Labor 5: 2 (seven times). As You Like It 3: 4.
Judas Maccabeus. Love's Labor 5: 1; 5: 2.
Barabbas. Mer. of Ven. 4: 1.
Lazarus. I Hen. IV. 4: 2.
Dives. I Hen. IV. 3: 3.
Pilate. Rich. II. 4: 1. Rich. III. 1: 4.
Prodigal Son. I Hen. IV. 4: 2. Merry Wives 4: 5. Winter's Tale 4: 2. II Hen. IV. 2: 1.
Peter (St. Peter). Much Ado 2: 1. Two Gent. 2: 3. Twelfth 3: 1. Othello 4: 2.
Paul (Saint, Apostle). Rich. III. 1: 2; 1: 3; 3: 4; 5: 3.
St. Philip's daughters. I Hen. VI. 1: 2.
Satan. Com. of Err. 4: 3: 4: 4. I Hen. IV. 2: 4. Merry Wives 5: 5. All's Well 5: 3.
The Devil. Ham. 2: 2; 3: 1. Mer. of Ven. 1: 3; 2: 2. Rich. III. 1: 2; 1: 3.

Beelzebub. Twelfth Night 5: 1. Hen. V. 4: 7. Macb. 2: 3.

Lucifer is once mentioned in the Bible (Isaiah XIV. 12) and Shakespeare uses the word with a similar meaning in Hen. VIII. 3: 2. Hen. V. 4: 7.

The following list of parallel passages will show still further that Shakespeare's mind was thoroughly imbued with the thoughts and teachings of Scripture. Some of the parallelisms show a literal quotation of Bible texts. Others reveal that the great dramatist has caught and interpreted the thought of the Scripture passage, and with new force has applied it to the life of man.

PARALLEL PASSAGES

Blessed are the peacemakers. (Matt. 5: 9)

Blessed are the peace-makers on earth. (II Hen. VI. 2: 1)

Forgive and ye shall be forgiven. (Luke 6: 37)

I as free forgive as I would be forgiven. (Hen. VIII. 2: 1)

Do good to them that hate you. (Matt. 5: 44)

Cherish those hearts that hate thee. (Hen. VIII. 3: 2)

Let every man be swift to hear, slow to speak, slow to wrath. (James 1: 19)

Give every man thine ear, but few thy voice.
Take each man's censure but reserve thy judgment (Ham. 1: 3)

For all have sinned. (Rom. 3: 23)

Forbear to judge, for we are sinners all. (II Hen. VI. 3: 3)

Love is the fulfilling of the law. (Rom. 13: 10)

Charity itself fulfills the law
And who can sever love from charity? (Love's Labor 4: 3)

Ye ask and receive not, because ye ask amiss. (James 4: 3)

We ignorant of ourselves
Beg often our own harms, which the wise powers
Deny us for our good. (Ant. and Cleo. 2: 1)

Though I be rude in speech. (2 Cor. 11: 6)

Rude am I in speech (Othello 1: 3)

Let them be blotted out of the book of the living. (Ps. 69: 28)

My name be blotted from the book of life. (Rich. II 1: 3)

There was a certain rich man which was clothed in purple. And there was a certain beggar named Lazarus . . . moveover the dogs came and licked his sores . . .
The beggar died, and was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom. (Luke 16: 22)

Dives that lived in purple. (I Hen. IV 3: 3)
As ragged as Lazarus in the painted cloth, where the glutton's dogs licked his sores. (I Hen. IV 4: 2)
Swect peace, conduct his soul to the bosom of good old Abraham. (Rich. II 4: 1)

Legion of Angels. (Matt. 26: 53)

Legions of angels. (Merry Wives 1: 3)

Then Herod . . . sent forth and slew all the children that were in Bethlehem . . .
In Rama was there a voice heard, lamentations and weeping and great mourning, Rachel weeping for her children and would not be comforted. (Matt. 2: 16, 18)

Whiles the mad, mothers with their howles confused,
Do break the clouds, as did the wives of Jewry.
At Herod's bloody-hunting slaughtermen. (Hen. V 3: 3)

He (Herod) said, Go and search diligently for the young child and when ye have found him, bring me word again that I may come and worship him. (Matt. 2: 8.)

Let me have a child to whom
Herod of Jewry may do homage. (Ant. and Cleo. 1: 2)

Then went the devils out of the man and entered the swine. (Luke 8: 33)

Bass. If it please you to dine with us!
Shy. Yes, to smell pork, to eat of the habitation which your prophet, the Nazarite, conjured the devil into. (Mer. of Ven. 1: 3)

He that dippeth his hand with me in the dish, the same shall betray me . . .	Who can call him his friend that dips in the same dish? (Tim. of Athens 3: 2)
And forthwith he (Judas) came to Jesus and said Hail, Master! and kissed him. (Matt. 26: 20, 21, 23, 49)	So Judas kiss'd his master, and cried All hail! when as he meant, all harm! (III Hen. VI 5: 7)
Thou hast brought me into the dust of death. (Ps. 22: 15)	—The waf to dusty death. (Macb. 5: 5)
Man is like to vanity: his days are a shadow that passeth away. (Ps. 144: 4)	Life's but a walking shadow . . . it is a tale.
We spend our years as a tale that is told (Ps. 90: 9)	Told by an idiot, dull of sound Signifying nothing. (Macb. 5: 5)
Their tongue is deceitful. (Micah 6: 12)	The tongues of men are full of deceits. (Hen. V 5: 2)
He that rolleth a stone it will return upon him. (Prov. 26: 27)	When we first put this dangerous stone a rolling T'would fall upon ourselves. (Hen. VIII 5: 2)
O generation of vipers. (Matt. 3: 7)	A generation of vipers. (Troi. and Cress. 3: 1)
Thou shalt not kill. (Ex. 20: 13) Thou shalt do no murder. (Matt. 19: 18)	The great Kings of Kings hath in the table of his law commanded. Thou shalt do no murder. (Rich. III 1: 4)
Thou shalt not steal. (Ex. 20: 15)	Thou shalt not steal. (Meas. for Meas. 1: 2)
He that toucheth pitch shall be defiled therewith. (Ecclus. 13: 1)	They that touch pitch will be defiled. (Much Ado. 3: 3) This pitch doth defile, so doth the company thou keepest. (I Hen. IV. 2: 4)
As he that lieth down in the midst of the sea, or as he that lieth down upon the top of a mast. (Prov. 23: 34)	Lives like a drunken sailor on a mast Ready with every nod to tumble down. Into the fatal bowels of the deep. (Rich. III 3: 4)
Then Jael . . . took a hammer in her hand . . . and smote the nail into his temples, and fastened it to the ground, for he was fast asleep. (Judges 4: 21)	I'll yield him thee asleep. Where thou may'st knock a nail into His head. (Tempest 3: 2)
Goliath of Gath . . . and the staff of his spear was like a weaver's beam. (1 Sam. 17: 7)	Goliath with a weaver's beam. (Merry Wives 5: 1)

A mind like Shakespeare's, imbued as it was with the Scripture, was, no doubt, unwaveringly assured of the fundamental truths of Christian doctrine. There is no trace of Mariolatry, nor of dependence for salvation upon ritual and ceremony. He believes in man's depravity, guilt, and need of supernatural redemption. The passages on Sin, Repentance, Redemption, Conscience attest that Shakespeare stood on the bed-rock of Christian doctrine. The following examples will illustrate the keen interpretation of Christian verities. Let us note what Shakespeare has to say in regard to *Sin*.

Man's nature is sinful:

"There's nothing level in our cursed natures,
But direct villainy" (Timon of A. 4: 3)

Sin has power to generate other sins:

"One sin, I know, another doth provoke"
(Pericles 1: 1)

"I am in
So far in blood, that sin will pluck on sin"
(Rich. III 4: 2)

All are sinners,—none are perfect:

"Forbear to judge, for we are sinners all."
(II Henry VI, 3: 3)

"Who lives that's not depraved or depraves?"
(Timon 1: 2)

"We are arrant knaves all;
Believe none of us."
(Hamlet 3: 1)

"Where's that palace where into foul things
Sometimes intrude not? who has a breast so pure,
But some uncleanly apprehensions
Keep leets and law-days, and in sessions sit
With meditations lawful?"
(Othello 3: 3)

The punishment of sin is death.

Shakespeare makes sin to bring its own judgment. "Be sure your sins will find you out" is the Scriptural law which, with a possible exception in Henry VIII, is always present in Shakespeare's plays. Be it Regan, or Goneril, or Iago, or Falstaff, or Macbeth, or Richard III,—all weave about them a net-work of disaster which eventually ends in death.

"Our natures do pursue,
Like rats that ravin down their proper bane,
A thirsty evil, and when we drink we die."

Judgement for the sinner, should he escape the laws of man, *will be visited on him at last.*

"If transgressors have defeated the law
And out-run native punishment,
Tho they can outstrip men, they have no wings
to fly from God." (Henry V, 4: 1)

"Can we out-run the heavens?"
(Henry VI, 5: 2)

Regarding Repentance Shakespeare holds that as long as the sinner clings to his sin, or fails to make restitution, there can be no true repentance. It is more than real penance or superficial sorrow. It touches and changes the heart.

"May one be pardon'd and retain the offense?"
(Hamlet 3: 3)

In "Measure for Measure" (2: 3) Juliet responds to the admonition of the duke to repent:

"I do repent me, as it is an evil,
And take the shame with joy."

That even reparation and sorrow do not suffice for the truly repentant man, Shakespeare shows in Henry V (4: 1)

"More will I do,
Though all that I can do is nothing worth;
Since that my penitence comes after all,
Imploring pardon."

But after all, in spite of what man may do, *Redemption is thru Christ.* Shakespeare's testimony is clear along this line. In "King Henry VI (II 3: 2) we read:

"That dread King took our state upon him
To free us from his Father's wrathful curse."

In "Measure for Measure" (2: 2):

"Why, all the souls that are, were forfeit once;
And He that might the vantage best have took
Found out the remedy."

In "Richard II" (2: 1):

"The world's ransom, blessed Mary's Son;

May these passages suffice to show Shakespeare's familiarity with the Bible and that not only the words of Holy Scripture, but their Spirit as well fill his mind.

ETHICAL THEORY OF SCHLEIERMACHER

(Continued)

By Elmer Arndt

III.

Ethics, for Schleiermacher, has relations both to natural science and to history. It is "on one hand seen as a contemplative science to be like and adjoining natural science, and on the other hand as the expression of reason to be like and adjoining history."[1] There is no essential difference between ethics and natural science in form; the difference is one of content only. For everything is predominantly characterized by one member of the antithesis in some respects and by the opposite in other respects. Consequently, no subject-matter belongs exclusively to one science. All being belongs in part to physics, in part to ethics, in part to natural history, in part to history, for it is the subject matter of each of these sciences in some respects. Since this is true no one science can be more developed than the other. "Ethics is at no time better than natural science and there is a continual equality (of development) in both."[2] Ethics is determined in both form and content by both physics and history. Here Schleiermacher expresses his belief in the fundamental unity of scientific theory and method. From this it follows that both a pure ethic and an applied ethic are impossible. The former is impossible because the formulae of pure ethics have no contents, since no being expresses himself through these formulae. For being involves a specific determination which a pure ethic does not recognize. The notion of an applied ethics is an empty idea because every ethical field can only be treated in relation to other fields if it is to be made comprehensible. An applied ethics forgets this fact, attempting as it does to abolish all distinctions between the fields of ethics and, let us say, history.

The same conviction of the fundamental unity of scientific theory and method which is exemplified in Schleiermacher's classification of the sciences is also exemplified in his position that moral law is analagous to natural law. In an address, "Ueber den Unterschied zwischen Naturgesetz und Sittengesetz",[3] read before the Royal Academy in 1825, the position is taken that there is no fundamental difference in form between moral law and natural law, for the only difference is that the two kinds of law deal with different kinds of being. Schleiermacher develops his argument by first showing that the usual interpretation of moral law and natural law gives to "law" a different meaning in the two instances. "Law" in

[1] *Schleiermachers Werke*, II, p. 537.
[2] *Ibid.*, II, p. 539.
[3] Included in the third division of the *Saemtliche Werke*, II, pp. 397-417. All references to this address are to this edition.

the sense of natural law means a statement about being, but in the sense of moral law means a statement about an ought. This conception empties the moral law of meaning, for it is impossible with such a difference between moral and natural law for the reason to address any demands to the sensibility. There is, however, another conception of natural and moral law. In this conception, moral law is no longer expressed as a categorical imperative, for the categorical imperative is a senseless undeveloped form of the moral law (*bewusstlose unentwickelte Form des Sittengesetzes*) which first becomes a practical reality and a scientifically tractable object when it is treated hypothetically and disjunctively. "The moral law is only a law, insofar as it determines a being, and not as a mere ought, for as such strictly taken, it can never be proved."[4] The difference then, is not between natural law and moral law but only between reason and nature. The difference "lies in the ought, which in addition to expressing a demand on the will remains the same whether the demand will be carried out or not."[5] But natural law also has this very character of expressing a demand and remaining the same whether or not it is fulfilled. If a man does evil, the moral laws are not changed; likewise if a man becomes ill, the laws of health are not broken; something else has interfered with them. Schleiermacher introduces in support of his argument a notion he borrowed from Steffan, his colleague in Halle, the conception namely, that there is a continuity of development from the physical through the vegetative and animal forms of life to the spiritual. This view resembles our modern conception of emergent evolution. All generic concepts (Gattungsbegriffe) of the various forms of individual life are true natural laws. And these generic concepts determine being "for all individuals of this kind or genus originate according to this law and their whole existence in their gradual development, culmination, and decline happens according to the same law."[6] And this law also depends on an ought. The moral law emerges on the level of spirit as the determination of spirit just as organic laws are the determination of the organic. The conclusion is, then, that "the determination of being in itself is . . . of the same kind and the ought is also of the same kind, only with the single difference that first with the entrance of the spirit the individual is free and only the spiritual life is volitional."[7] The moral laws are higher than the natural laws just as the human individual is higher than rocks, plants, or animals. But there is no difference in kind between the two types of law.

The character of ethical science is, therefore, not normative,

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 409
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 410
[6] *Ibid.*, p. 412.
[7] *Ibid.*, p. 416.

as Kant held, but descriptive. It is descriptive of the essences, principles, and laws to which being conforms insofar as it is predominantly reasonable. In this connection, Schleiermacher undertakes a polemic against Kant's formulation of the ought as quite inadmissible (*ganz unzulaessig*) because it rests on a discord against the law which has been represented as appearance by science. Kant's presentation of the categorical imperative presupposes a speaker and one addressed. Four possibilities are open. The practical reason can address sensibility (*Sinnlichkeit*). But in the latter there is no impulse to general lawfulness nor even a judgment concerning it, if something, which can be really done contradicts the lawful or not. Or the reason addresses the higher desires. If that is the case, then the reason would desire, which is impossible, for it is not the business of the reason to desire. Or the general reason can address itself to the reason of the individual. But if this is true the concept of duty is lost, for if a man demands a duty of himself, then his desires are will and not the ought. Or, lastly, the theoretical reason commands the practical reason. But this activity is not to be differentiated from the activity of that which does not rest on science. For then one would put before oneself in the moment of activity a particular ought without putting it in a general connection from a scientific point of view. As we have seen, the only form in which Schleiermacher will admit the imperative is the hypothetical: "*Wenn du vernuenftig sein willst*, so handle so!" The law of reason is natural law. And, therefore, the propositions of ethics are not commands but laws "which express the actual activity of reason on nature."[8] And this statement means that "if natural law and moral law so fall together in the province of human freedom, that from human nature everything comes forth healthy and perfectly developed, what man ought to do conformable to his reason and nothing else, then must reason prepare in its ethical demands all that which the healthy nature actually brings to light."[9]

IV.

Schleiermacher holds that ethics, as the descriptive science of the operation of reason on nature, should be presented from three points on view: from the points of view of the doctrine of the good, of the doctrine of duties, and of the doctrine of virtues. Goods, duties, and virtues are related to each other as are final, formal, and efficient causes of the same process. The doctrine of the good corresponds to forms in organic nature; the doctrine of duties to movement in organic nature; the doctrine of virtues to power in organic nature. But the science of ethics could be completely

[8] *Saemmtliche Werke*, III, 5, p. 58.
[9] *Ibid.*, III, 2, p. 454f.

represented from the point of view of any one of these three. For each of them, when perfectly developed, is the complete expression of the whole unity of reason and nature. To avoid onesidedness, however, ethics should be treated from all points of view. The exposition of the doctrine of the highest good, on which Schleiermacher lays most emphasis, will serve to illustrate his method and embody his major teaching.

For Schleiermacher, the good is varied and rich. He defines the highest good, not as some particular good under which all others are hierarchically arranged, but as the whole ethical being. It is not a good but the harmony of goods. "The highest good is not one good comparable to the others, in comparison with them prominent as the best; rather it expresses the organic connection of all goods, therefore the whole ethical being under the concept of the good." [10] The various goods "form the highest good, not in their separated being but in their connected being, as also the ethical being displayed in the multiplicity of goods is to be conceived not otherwise than in its double character of its being as law (*Gesetztseins*) and being as lifted up (*Aufgehobenseins*). That means, not only is nothing in its essence altogether isolated, but also only as reason is in it is a community formed with others." [11] It is the content of all goods (*Inbegriff aller wahren Gueter*). We have no special knowledge of the highest good. All we can know of it is that it is the connection *(Ineinander)* and interpenetration (*Durcheinander*) of all individual goods.

Here again Schleiermacher confronts us with two antitheses, reason and nature and the universal and the individual. Since there is no first entrance of reason into nature, the organized (i. e. nature interpenetrated with reason) must be always and everywhere already given; but as there is everywhere activity of the reason, organization must be occurring through the activity of reason. The activity of reason to manifest itself in what is already organized is called the symbolizing activity of reason. The most common form of the symbolizing activity of reason is consciousness, for it is the recognition of reason by reason. It is called the symbolizing activity because this recognition among men can only take place when reason recognizes reason in a human soul. Without this activity of reason society would be impossible. The aim of the symbolizing activity is the total manifestation of the total reason so that all reason would be manifested and every earthly nature would enter into this manifestation. [12] The activity of reason which fashions nature is the organizing activity. In this activity, reason is the

[10] *Schleiermachers Werke*, II, p. 552; cf., *Saemmtliche Werke*, III, 2, p. 471.
[11] *Ibid.*, p. 569.
[12] Cf. *Saemmtliche Werke*, II, 2, p. 477.

moving principle with the end in view of the possible organization of the whole of earthly nature for the spiritual functions of men.[13] Reason is thus viewed under two aspects, Symbol and Organ. With regard to the second antithesis, the being of reason in human nature is only complete through the ethical community of persons. But at the same time the being of reason is only complete insofar as each individual and his sphere is separated from other individuals and their spheres. "Since now community and isolation exclude one another and yet each should be fixed through morality so both should be definitely opposed, and only that is a perfectly established morality whereby community will be established, which in another regard is isolation, and isolation, which in another regard is community, is established." [14]

The organization of Nature is the same for all so far as each one has the same organized nature before him and in himself. But the organization of Nature is different for each man, insofar as each has a differently organized nature and a different sphere to organize. There are thus both a common task for humanity and a specific task for the individual. As far as each individual is differently organized and stands in a different relation to nature, his sphere of activity is differentiated from the rest and each will be a complete whole in himself. This is the manner in which Schleiermacher tried to do justice to both the universal character of morals and the specific and unique individual. The balancing of the universal and the individual is further brought out in the balance between the earth and the human body. As the earth is the greatest sphere for the organization for humanity as a whole, the body is the smallest sphere for the organizing activity of the individual. Yet the two must be brought together. Now from the human body to the whole earth, everything is for ethical being an interpenetration of unity and difference. Everywhere property and commerce are only partially opposed, and everywhere isolation and community only relatively opposed. The partial antithesis between property and commerce almost disappears in the family, appears again in the nation as custom, and between nations as treaty. The relation of the individual to the whole is finally the free society. In such a free society the individual organizing activity appears as an integral part of the universal activity of reason. Likewise there is an interpenetration of unity and difference in the ethical being from the individual self-consciousness to the collective consciousness of the human race. Everywhere thought and feeling are only partially opposed and everywhere isolation and communication are only relatively in opposition.

[13] Cf. *Ibid.*, III, 2, pp. 476f.
[14] *Ibid.*, II, p. 578.

Schleiermacher finds four spheres of the good. These spheres are arrived at by crossing a predominently organic manifold and a predominantly intellectual manifold with a predominantly individual manifold and one predominantly universal. The result is that we have: 1) The State, a province in which nature appears predominantly as the organ of a universal reason; 2) Fellowships in which nature appears predominantly as the organ of an individual reason; 3) Schools in which nature appears predominantly as the symbol of a universal reason; 4) Churches in which nature appears predominantly as the symbol of an individual reason. These abstractions are connected with concrete realms of life, namely, commerce, private property, knowledge, and religion. Corresponding to these four spheres of the good are the four ethical relations of right, fellowship, faith, and revelation. The terms are defined thus: The ethical coexistence of individuals in commerce is the relation of right or the mutual dependence of acquisition and society. The ethical relation of individuals to each other in the seclusion of their private property is that of fellowship or the mutual dependence of the inalienable and common possession. The relation of individuals to one another in the community of spoken thought is that of faith or the mutual dependence of the pupils and teachers on the common property of speech and vice versa, the dependence of the common property of speech on the teachers and pupils. The relation of individuals to one another in the difference of their feeling is revelation.

In the description of the spheres of the good and the corresponding ethical relations, Schleiermacher is expressing what he himself had experienced. As one of the first he had begun to treat friendship as an art; as one of the first, he began to live for the state in a troubled time; above all, he began in his experience as a preacher, ecclesiastical statesman, and theologian to esteem and value the historical task of the church. Here also comes to full expression his attempt to do justice to the individual and the whole. The economic life is not to be governed by the doctrines of *laissez faire* but it is to be regulated by the state. The quest for knowledge is to be pursued in schools yet there is place for activity which is not controlled by definite organization. In antithesis to the regulated economic life within the state is the realm of private property to be enjoyed in free fellowship. If the schools are dependent for the advancement of science on a common national language which will express precise meanings, the churches provide the sphere in which each individual through feeling is united with the whole of humanity.

(To be concluded)

Die religionspädagogische Lage im gegenwärtigen Deutschland

Professor D. Dr. H. Werdermann, Dortmund.

Die religionspädagogischen Fragen sind seit 150 Jahren und auch im letzten Menschenalter immer wieder erörtert worden. Der Grund dazu war allein schon der äußere Umstand, daß ja evangelischer Religionsunterricht ordentliches Lehrfach aller staatlichen und privaten Schulen war. Bis zum Weltkrieg wurden in allen Volksschulen die acht Jahre hindurch wöchentlich fünf bis sechs Religionsstunden erteilt und in den höheren Schulen die neun Jahre hindurch wöchentlich zwei Stunden. Diese regelmäßige Ausübung solcher ausgedehnten religionspädagogischen Pflicht ließ bei den Lehrern die methodischen und grundsätzlichen Fragen nie zur Ruhe kommen. Und die Kirche hatte daneben an denselben Kindern, die durch die öffentlichen Schulen gingen, den Konfirmandenunterricht zu erteilen, der je nachdem ein oder zwei Jahre währte, so daß auch die Pfarrerkreise immer mehr neben der Homiletik, die seit der Reformation im Vordergrund stand, auch die Katechetik gepflegt wissen wollten. Dazu kam, daß nicht nur in den Städten, sondern auch auf dem Land der Kindergottesdienst immer mehr Kinder in die Kirche führte; und die Frage, wie sie am wirkungsvollsten christlich und kirchlich erzogen werden könnten, bewegte namentlich die jüngere Pfarrerschaft.

Als dann 1918 die **Novemberrevolution** erfolgte, schien der erste sozialistische Kultusminister Adolf Hoffmann radikal allen Religionsunterricht in den Staatsschulen abschaffen zu wollen. Das gelang ihm nicht. Die Elternschaft erhob schärfsten Protest dagegen, und die verfassunggebende Nationalversammlung in Weimar behielt den Religionsunterricht, wenn auch in etwas beschränkter Stundenzahl, in den Volks- und höheren Schulen als ordentliches Lehrfach bei. Zwar wurden neben den evangelischen und katholischen Schulen auch sogenannte „weltliche Schulen" eingerichtet — die jedoch bis zuletzt selbst in den Großstädten nie mehr als ein Zehntel der Kinder erreichten.

Aber gerade ihr Vorhandensein stellte dem Religionspädagogen neue Fragen und Aufgaben. Wie mußte der Religionsunterricht in der Gegenwart erteilt werden, daß er die Kinder fesselte, so daß sie selbst sich nicht davon lossagten (was ihnen rechtlich mit dem zwölften Jahre erlaubt war), und sie sogar ihre Eltern baten, ihn weiterhin mitnehmen zu dürfen, wenn diese aus politischen oder weltanschaulichen Gründen sie abmelden wollten. Wie sollte man sich zu dem Vorschlag eines sogenannten religionsgeschichtlichen oder

objektiven Religionsunterrichts verhalten, der gemacht wurde? Was war Berechtigtes an den Forderungen eines gesonderten Moralunterrichtes? Welche Folgerungen waren aus der zunehmenden Proletarisierung der Bevölkerung für die religiöse Erziehung zu ziehen? Im Jahre 1922 erschienen in Preußen „Richtlinien" für alle Fächer, auch für den Religionsunterricht. Die Zusammenarbeit der staatlichen und kirchlichen Behörden hatte dabei z. B. für die Volksschulen als Ziel herausgestellt: „Durch Weckung und Pflege der religiösen Anlagen des Kindes soll der evangelische Religionsunterricht zum Aufbau seiner gesamten religiös-sittlichen Persönlichkeit beitragen und ihm die Grundlage zur Führung eines evangelisch-christlichen Lebens innerhalb der Gemeinde vermitteln. Er hat im besonderen die Aufgabe, Wesen und Wahrheit des Christentums nach reformatorischer Auffassung, der Entwicklungsstufe der Schüler entsprechend, zur Darstellung und zum Verständnis zu bringen. Sein Inhalt ist das Evangelium, nach seiner Vorbereitung im Alten Testament."

Kam so die religionspädagogische Frage von außen her aufs neue in Fluß und zu einem gewissen Abschluß, so kam im letzten Jahrzehnt neues Leben in die religionspädagogische Aussprache von der Theologie, von der Kirche her. In ihr waren zwei neue Lebensquellen aufgebrochen, einerseits ein neues vertieftes **Lutherverständnis**, das durch alle die Erinnerungsfeiern seit dem Jahre 1917 neu belebt wurde und durch wertvolle Neuveröffentlichungen, unter denen die Lutheraufsätze von K. Holl (Tübingen, Mohr. 1. Auflage 1921. 5. Auflage 1932) und Heinrich Böhmers Schriften: Luther im Licht der neueren Forschung (Teubner 1928) und der junge Luther (Leipzig 1925) obenan stehen. Anderseits wirkte die Anregung der **dialektischen** Theologie sich auch sehr bald auf die religionspädagogischen Gebiete aus. Wo Gott und Gottes Wirklichkeit und Gottes Anspruch und Gottes Gericht so ernst genommen und so wirksam verkündet wurden, da konnte auch der Praktiker in Schule und Kirche nicht unberührt bleiben. Allerdings dauert es ja stets eine gewisse Zeit, ehe die neuen Lebensäußerungen aus den Bezirken der systematischen und biblischen Theologie bis in die praktische Theologie dringen und dort verarbeitet werden. Aber wie in der ganzen Weltentwicklung ein rascheres Tempo gekommen war, so jetzt auch ins geistige Leben. Von der dialektischen Theologie her war es E. Thurneysen, der Karl Barths Gedanken für den Religionsunterricht fruchtbar machte („Das Wort Gottes und die Kirche"). Ganz besonders ist aber G. Bohnes Buch: Wort Gottes und der Unterricht (Furche-Verlag 2. 1932) zu nennen, das eine lebhafte Diskussion, ein erregtes Für oder Wider hervorrief. Von Seiten des vertieften Lutherverständnisses suchte Th. Heckel in seiner Schrift: Zur Methodik des Religionsunterrichts (Kaiser, München. 2. 1931)

die religiöse Unterweisung anzuregen und umzugestalten. Er ging davon aus, daß die Religionspädagogik ihr Eigenrecht im ganzen letzten Jahrhundert zu sehr preisgegeben habe. Sie sei immer mehr nur ein Anhängsel der allgemeinen Pädagogik geworden. Und das sei für beide Teile von schlimmen Folgen gewesen. Das Richtige kann nur in der Wirklichkeit der beiden Sätze erfaßt werden: Die Religionspädagogik ist allerdings eine Provinz der allgemeinen Pädagogik. Sie darf die Fühlung mit ihr nicht verlieren. Sie darf nicht etwa eine Generation hinter der allgemeinen Erziehungslehre hinterherhinken. Aber ebenso kräftig muß der zweite Satz ausgesprochen werden: Die Religionspädagogik hat ihr Eigengebiet, ihre Eigengesetzlichkeit, ihren eigenartigen Inhalt und ihre besondre Aufgabe. Dies darf sie nie außer acht lassen, da sie sonst ihr Bestes preisgibt! Die Religionspädagogik darf sich nicht einfach vermischen mit der Gesamtpädagogik, noch sich sektenhaft von ihr absondern, sonst entsteht die unglückliche Lage: Der evangelische Religionsunterricht wird unpädagogisch; die Pädagogik unevangelisch. Die Pädagogik wird wirklichkeitsversunken; der Religionsunterricht wirklichkeitsfremd. Hellmut Schreiner versucht in einer „Pädagogik aus Glauben" (Bahn, Schwerin) die Erziehungslehre von der Rechtfertigung allein aus Glauben, von der Vergebung her neu zu erfassen. Dabei behandelt er die besondre Aufgabe, die die Fürsorgeerziehung und die Anstaltserziehung dem christlichen Pädagogen stellt. Schließlich ist hier zu nennen H. Werdermann, Luther als Erzieher und die Religionspädagogik der Gegenwart (Bertelsmann, Gütersloh, 1933). Ferner hat uns das Katechismus-Erinnerungsjahr das erschöpfende Werk von Joh. Meyer, Historisch-kritischer Kommentar zu Luthers kleinem Katechismus (Gütersloh 1929) gebracht, außerdem Michael Reus Buch: D. Martin Luthers kleiner Katechismus, die Geschichte seiner Entstehung, seiner Verbreitung, seines Gebrauchs (München 1929).

So sind von außen und innen her alle Fragen wieder in Fluß gekommen. Für eine Belebung der Religionsunterrichtsprobleme hat auch die starke Gegenarbeit gesorgt, die von dem Freidenkertum und der Gottlosenbewegung ausging. Durch die immer mächtigeren Verbände, durch Protektion der Novemberrepublik, durch Versammlungen, durch Propaganda in Wort und Bild, gerade auch unter der Jugend und den Schulkindern, wurden diese Gedanken an alle Kreise und alle Kinder herangetragen. Und um selbst fest zu bleiben und um dem Gegner antworten zu können, mußten die christlichen Grundfragen neu durchdacht werden. Denn es ging wirklich um die Grundlagen und **Grundfragen.** Seit den Zeiten des Pädagogen Herbart hatten im allgemeinen die methodischen Fragen im Vordergrund gestanden, die Einführung und Vorbereitung, die Darbietung und Ausgestaltung, die Zusammenfassung und die

Anwendung. Lange hatte die Frage, ob und wie weit der Arbeitsschulgedanke fruchtbar zu machen sei, die Gemüter bewegt.

Dann hatten vor allem die kinderpsychologischen Fragen die Aufmerksamkeit auf sich gezogen. Wie der Mensch in der ganzen Welt in den Mittelpunkt des Interesses gerückt war, so trat das Kind immer mehr in den Mittelpunkt des Unterrichtes und die Forderung der „Pädagogik vom Kind her" zwang auch den Religionslehrer, sich mit dem Kind, dem Einzelkind, der Kindesseele im allgemeinen sich zu beschäftigen. Dazu kam durch den sozialen Zug der Zeit und die wirtschaftliche Umschichtung die Milieukunde. Wie sieht das Leben aus, aus dem die Kinder kommen, das die Kinder außerhalb der Schule leben und in das hinein wir die Kinder entlassen? Fruchtbar waren hier die Untersuchungen und Zusammenstellungen von G. Dehn, Proletarische Jugend (3. Furche-Verlag 1932).

Von dem neuen Lutherverständnis her und von der dialektischen Theologie her wurde nun aber der Religionsunterricht grundsätzlich nach seinem Wesen und seiner Berechtigung und Möglichkeit gefragt. Und bei dieser Ueberprüfung des vorhandenen Religionsunterrichts stellte es sich heraus, daß der landläufige Religionsunterricht in starkem Maße **Abwege** und Irrwege gegangen war. Die Hauptgefahren seien hier andeutungsweise aufgeführt: die Gefahr des **Aesthetisierens.** Dies trat am stärksten bei der biblischen Geschichte hervor. Der Lehrer kündigte der Klasse an, er wolle eine „schöne" Geschichte erzählen. Wenn irgend möglich, hängte er ein „schönes Anschauungsbild" vor die Klasse hin. War er mit der Darbietung fertig, fragte er die Kinder: Was hat euch an dieser Geschichte „gefallen," lauter Kategorien aus dem Gebiet der Aesthetik, aber nicht des Christentums. Als ob irgendeine Geschichte in der Bibel unter diesem Gesichtspunkt und zu diesem Zweck erzählt wäre!

Eine zweite Gefahr war die des **Historisierens.** Das Geschichtliche, das Zeitgeschichtliche, das Kulturgeschichtliche drängte sich in den Vordergrund. Gewiß können wir keinen Religionsunterricht ohne all dies geben, da die Geschichten aus einer fernen Zeit und einem fremden Land stammen. Aber die Nebensachen, Mittel wurden zum Zweck. Und die Kinder, die stets dazu neigen, gerade auf Kleinigkeiten zu achten, nehmen das Beiwerk für das Wesentliche! Gewiß wollen wir das Interesse der Kinder erwecken und wach erhalten. Aber keinesfalls darf durch Ueberbetonung des Historischen bei den biblischen Geschichten der Eindruck erweckt werden: Es war einmal!

Erwähnt werden muß auch die Gefahr des **Banalisierens.** Diese trat dann hervor, wenn man statt der berechtigten „Vergegenwärti-

gung" des Bibelgehaltes zu einer trivialen Modernisierung in der Ausgestaltung der biblischen Geschichte sich verleiten ließ. Ferner wurden die Geschichten oft gar zu sehr breit getreten. Denn während vor dem Weltkrieg die Religions-Lehrpläne oft mit Stoff überfüllt waren, waren die neuen Lehrpläne, hauptsächlich unter dem Einfluß der Lehrerkreise, mit so wenig Inhalt versehen, daß nun statt des Zuviel ein Zuwenig herausgekommen war! Auch die Gefahr der „Verharmlosung" des ernsten Bibelgehaltes, wobei der Salzgehalt des Gotteswortes verloren geht, gehört hierher.

Recht häufig war die Gefahr des **Intellektualisierens**. Die vorige Lehrergeneration war ja in einem ausgesprochen intellektualistischen, ja rationalistischen Zeitalter groß geworden. Dabei besteht die Gefahr des Intellektualisierens sowohl für den liberalen Protestantismus, dessen Darsteller auf religionspädagogischem Gebiet Fr. Niebergall in zahllosen Veröffentlichungen gewesen ist, als auch in dem trocknen orthodox-dogmatisierenden Verfahren vieler traditioneller Religionsbücher und Pastoren, die eine Populardogmatik darboten und einprägten, die wohl den Verstand beschäftigte, aber nicht wie Sauerteig das ganze Wesen durchdringen konnte. Am allerhäufigsten war aber die Gefahr des **„Moralisierens."** Das hatte seine philosophischen Gründe, da seit Kant oftmals die Religion nur als Unterbau für die Ethik aufgefaßt war. Das hatte eine pädagogische Wurzel in dem System Herbarts, der als Ziel der Schulerziehung „Charakterstärke der Sittlichkeit" hingestellt hatte, wobei der Religionsunterricht als ein „Erziehungsmittel" eingefügt war. Infolge dieses Moralisierens wurde dann stets am Ende der Stunde eine „Anwendung" gemacht und die Frage gestellt: Was können wir daraus lernen? Selbst so zarte religiöse Geschichten wie die von Jesu Kampf in Gethsemane wurden damit nicht verschont! Damit wurde dem Evangelium Gewalt angetan, das eine Frohbotschaft und kein Moralsystem ist. Dieses Moralisieren widerstreitet aber auch dem Empfinden des normalen Kindergemütes, das im Grund nichts langweiliger empfindet als das am Schluß jeder Religionsstunde ertönende: So sollt ihr auch . . . .! Als letzter Irrweg sei der angeführt, daß besonders in den höheren Schulen der „evangelische Religionsunterricht" nur sehr wenig mit dem reformatorisch aufgefaßten Evangelium Jesu Christi, sondern nur mit allgemeiner „Religion" zu tun hatte. Das allgemein Religiöse wurde gelehrt, Religionsgeschichte einst und jetzt getrieben, das Ewige relativiert. Und man merkte nicht, daß man dabei in der Sphäre des bloß Menschlichen blieb, da „Religion" doch höchstens das Suchen und Träumen der Menschen ist, während evangelisches Christentum Gottes Urteil über eines Menschen Wesen, auch seine Frömmigkeit, und Gottes Antwort auf dieses Fragen und Sehnen ist.

Denn auf **Gott** kommt es im Religionsunterricht an, im evangelischen Religionsunterricht auf den Gott, der sich uns in Christus als den Heiligen und Gnädigen offenbart. Hier hatte die Theologie des 19. Jahrhunderts selbst oft versagt. Es war ein Einbruch des Menschlich-allzu-Menschlichen auch in die Theologie erfolgt. Das Anthropozentrische und Egozentrische hatte sich auch in der Frömmigkeit, dem frommen Denken, in der kirchlichen Praxis breitgemacht. Jetzt war wieder der Ruf nach einer **theozentrischen** Theologie laut geworden. Gott ist nicht der Gegenstand der Spekulation, der religionsgeschichtlichen Forschung, der Untersuchung, der Kritik! Er ist nicht nur „Grenzbegriff" des Denkens. Sondern er ist die Wirklichkeit aller Wirklichkeit. Nicht wir „haben" ihn, sondern er hat uns. Ihn können wir nicht unterrichtlich darstellen oder gar durch geschickte Methoden den Kindern andemonstrieren. Wir dürfen nicht vorschnell oder gar plump vertraulich von ihm als dem „lieben" Gott reden. Er ist und bleibt der Heilige, der Majestätische. Er ist und bleibt, auch wo er sich offenbart, der Verborgene. Das furchtbare Erleben im Weltkrieg hatte das der jetzigen Theologen- und Religionslehrer-Generation deutlich werden lassen. Wo Gott ist, ist Geheimnis. Wo er ist, ist Gericht. Wo er spricht, da werden Entscheidungen gefordert. Theologisches Denken ist existenzielles Denken; da geht es um Sein oder Nichtsein der Menschen, des Erwachsenen und des Jugendlichen. Er ist der Allmächtige, vor dem wir im Kreaturgefühl erzittern. In seiner Nähe vergeht uns aller „Scholarchendünkel," als wären wir als Lehrpersonen „schöpferische Menschen" und könnten unsre Kinder zu einer „schöpferischen" Klasse umgestalten. Alles, was Erfinder erfunden, Denker gedacht und Pädagogen gelehrt haben, verdient, an seinem Maßstab gemessen, überhaupt nicht den Ruhmestitel des „Schöpferischen." Da bleibt all unser Tun, auch das des genialsten Pädagogen „fragwürdig." Wir werden uns unsrer Kleinheit und Ohnmacht bewußt. Aber gerade dann werden wir innerlich vorbereitet dazu, nun auch Gottes Barmherzigkeit und Gnade zu empfangen. Jetzt wird es uns erst ganz groß, daß der verborgene Gott sich uns offenbart hat als „der Vater unsers Herrn Jesu Christi," der „uns alle unsre Sünde vergibt und heilet alle unsre Gebrechen."

Um all dies muß der Religionslehrer wissen. Nun bekommt seine Tätigkeit ein ganz anderes Gesicht. Diese ist in erster Linie **„Verkündigung."** Religionsunterricht kann nicht vom geschickten Lehrer her gegeben werden, auch nicht vom Kind her entwickelt werden, sondern evangelischer Religionsunterricht ist immer „von Gott her," geschieht in seinem Auftrag und führt zu ihm hin. Wir geben nicht uns selbst, sondern bezeugen den, der über uns selbst mächtig geworden ist. Wahrer Religionsunterricht wird gegeben „zu Gottes Ehre." Und unsre Klasse wird eine „Gemeinde der

andächtig Hörenden," die hinlauschen auf das, was Gott uns, was Gott jedem Einzelnen zu sagen hat. Dazu ist uns die Bibel gegeben. Sie ist unser größter Schatz im evangelischen Religionsunterricht. Allerdings haben wir diesen Schatz in „irdenen Gefäßen," und gelegentlich müssen wir auch davon reden. Aber Bibelkunde und Bibelkritik sind im Grund etwas Peripherisches gegenüber dem Zentralen, daß wir hier auch heute noch die „viva vox" in ihr haben, durch die der Heilige Geist zu uns redet. Dafür muß den jugendlichen in der religiösen Unterweisung eine Ahnung aufgehen. Uns kommt es nicht auf das Alte Testament, nicht auf Einzelgestalten in ihnen an, weder auf Jakob noch auf Moses, weder auf David noch Jesaias, sondern wie Gott mit ihnen gehandelt hat und durch ihre Geschichte zu uns redet. Auf Gott in der Geschichte, auf Gott in der Natur, auf Gott in Jesus Christus kommt es an.

So ist die **Ewigkeitsaufgabe** des Religionsunterrichts wieder stark in den Vordergrund gerückt worden. Natürlich hat er auch eine zeitgeschichtliche Seite, über die jede Generation von neuem nachsinnen muß. Und dazu sind die Religionspädagogen gerade auch durch die gewaltigen **Erlebnisse des Jahres 1933** aufgefordert worden, wo wir als Volk bis in die Tiefe erschüttert und zu vorher kaum geahnter Freudigkeit hinaufgehoben wurden, wo wir wieder erleben durften, daß wir ein Volk sind, trotz aller unglückseligen langen Zersplitterung; daß in dem Erbgut der Väter, in Blut und Boden Schätze verborgen liegen, deren wir uns wieder mehr bewußt werden müssen, die wir pflegen müssen; daß in unserm ganzen Volk aus der Stimmung vom „Untergang des Abendlandes" plötzlich die Hoffnung aufbrach, daß ein neuer deutscher Tag für uns und unsre Jugend anbrechen würde. Urkräfte des Lebens brachen da wieder auf, die alles und alle ergriffen. Das stellte auch den Religionspädagogen vor neue Aufgaben. Es wurde uns klar, wie wenig wir die Aufgabe des Paulus weitergeführt hatten, wenn er einst sich bemüht hatte, den Juden ein Jude, den Griechen ein Grieche zu werden; wie es da noch ganz anders unsre Pflicht sei, auch in der religiösen Verkündigung in Kirche und Schule „den Deutschen ein Deutscher" zu werden. Dabei erschien es wie eine göttliche Fügung, daß wir gerade im Jahre 1933 das Jubiläum des 450. Geburtstages D. Martin Luthers feiern durften, der bei aller Verpflichtung dem ewigen Wort Gottes gegenüber doch so betont sich als „Prophet der Deutschen" gewußt hatte und gesagt hatte: „Meinen Deutschen bin ich geboren." Es wurde uns klar, daß es vor ihm und erst recht seit ihm eine „deutsche Linie in der Kirchengeschichte" gibt,* die neben einer jüdischen, römischen, grie-

* s. H. Werdermann oben a. a. O. S. 97—107.

chischen, angelsächsischen Linie gesehen, herausgearbeitet und fortgeführt werden muß. Es gibt keinen „deutschen Gott," aber eine deutsche Art, fromm zu sein und auf die Botschaft des Evangeliums einzugehen.

Es ist in einem kurzen Uebersichtsaufsatz unmöglich, alle die Einzelfragen zu berühren, die in Zusammenhang mit der grundsätzlichen Klärung in Fluß gekommen sind. Zwei mögen noch herausgegriffen werden. Da ist zunächst ein neues Verständnis dem religiösen **Lernstoff** gegenüber. Hatte es früher einen „Memoriermaterialismus" gegeben, daß man geglaubt hatte, durch eine Menge gedächtnismäßig eingeübten Lernstoffes die Frömmigkeit zu schaffen oder gar erzwingen zu können, so war seit 1900 der Gegenschlag erfolgt. Man pflegte das Auswendiglernen nicht mehr, verachtete und verwarf es. Aber gerade wieder im Krieg war es vielen klar geworden, daß ein Schatz kräftiger Bibelsprüche und wertvoller Gesangbuchlieder das Wertvollste ist, was man aus dem Religionsunterricht mit ins Leben nehmen kann. Es ist dem modernen Religionslehrer klar, daß er nicht zu viel fordern darf, daß er nur das Wertvollste aussucht, und daß er es nicht als gesetzesmäßigen Zwang den Kindern auferlegt, sondern in Freiwilligkeit und mit Freude von ihnen lernen läßt, selbst wenn die Kinder noch nicht alles „verstehen" können. Er versucht ein Vor-Verständnis zu erwecken; das andre überläßt er dem späteren Leben und Erleben und der Führung des Vaters im Himmel. E. Pfennigsdorf hat die Grundsätze kurz zusammengefaßt: nur gründlich Durchgesprochenes; nur Gehaltvolles; nie zu viel; regelmäßig; das wirklich Aufgegebene fest! Dieser Lernstoff hat später seine Bedeutung für den Einzelnen, in frohen und schweren Lebenslagen Er hat seine Bedeutung aber auch für die Gemeinschaft. Denn der Religionsunterricht der Gegenwart strebt hinweg von dem Individualisieren zur Gemeinschaftserziehung, zur Einbettung und späteren Eingliederung in die Gemeinde und Kirche.

Sehr wesentlich ist schließlich, daß in der Gegenwart wieder mit ganzem Ernst von der Bedeutung der **Lehrerpersönlichkeit** gesprochen wird. Es kommt nicht auf den geschickten Methodiker, auch nicht den experimentell und kritisch geschulten Psychologen an, so erfreulich beides an seinem Ort und in seiner Art ist. Es kommt viel mehr auf den Religionslehrer als Menschen und als Christen an. Im Grund wirkt auf eine Klasse nicht so sehr, wie man etwas sagt, sondern was man sagt und wer es sagt! Da kommen wir her aus einer innerlich zerrissenen Periode, wo viele Religionslehrer vom Kritizismus angekränkelt und unsicher geworden waren, wo andre ein traditionelles Lehrgut weitergaben nur als „religiöse Speditöre," wie Dörpfeld ironisch sagt. Für beides haben die Kinder und erst recht die reifere Jugend ein feines Empfinden und

eine starke Ablehnung. Religion kann ja nicht „gelehrt“ werden, rein unterrichtsmäßig, sondern muß „übertragen“ werden, muß überspringen wie der elektrische Funke. „Mit einem Eiszapfen kann man kein Feuer anzünden“ (Warneck). Wo es recht steht, muß der Forderung der „Verkündigung“ des Religionsunterrichtes, von der wir sprachen, eine „zeugnishafte“ Art bei dem Religionslehrer entsprechen, wie es in stärkster Weise aus der ersten Jüngerschar zu uns klingt: „Wir können's ja nicht lassen, daß wir nicht reden sollten von dem, was wir selbst gesehen und gehört haben.“ Der Religionslehrer, auch der beste, muß selbst leben „aus der Vergebung heraus.“ Aber darum kann er mit Jesusaugen schauen auf seine Klasse, kann sie mit Liebe und Geduld, mit Glauben und Hoffnung belehren und führen. So ist in der Religionspädagogik gegenwärtig alles in Fluß gekommen, aber das ist ein Zeichen neuen Lebens. Und die gegenwärtige Generation sucht ihre Arbeit zu tun in dem doppelten Bewußtsein: „Unsre Arbeit ist machtlos im Blick auf das Ziel, aber darum nicht zwecklos“ und: „Wir können nicht gering genug von uns selbst, aber nicht hoch genug von unsrer Aufgabe denken.“

Zum hundertsten Todestag Schleiermachers, des großen Theologen,

12. Februar 1934.

Von Dr. C. Schieler †.

Zum ehrenden Gedächtnis dieses hochverdienten Mannes soll hier versucht werden, eine kurze Darstellung seines theologischen Systems zu geben.

Zuvor eine Bemerkung über Schleiermachers Stellung in der Geschichte der Theologie. Als er auftrat, fand er den Rationalismus und den sogenannten Supranaturalismus vor. Beide hat er überwunden und der Theologie neue Bahnen eröffnet. „Von herrnhutischer Gefühlswärme und Begeisterung für den Erlöser und die Gemeinschaft der Gläubigen durchdrungen, von ästhetischen Ideen der Romantik befruchtet, durch das Studium Kants in der scharfen Fassung der Wissensprobleme geübt, hat er die Theologie auf das unmittelbare christliche Bewußtsein gegründet und die Eigentümlichkeit des Christentums auf die Erlösung durch Christus zurückgeführt." Er hat das Gebiet des wissenschaftlichen Erkennens, welchem nur das Endliche erreichbar ist, und das Gebiet der religiösen Gewißheit klar von einander geschieden und den Sitz der letzteren in dem innersten Grund unsrer Seele aufgezeigt.

Schleiermachers theologisches Hauptwerk ist: **„Der christliche Glaube nach den Grundsätzen der evangelischen Kirche im Zusammenhang dargestellt."** 1. Ausgabe 1821—1822, 2. umgearbeitete Ausgabe 1830—1831. In seinem Nekrolog auf Schleiermacher hat de Wette schon dieses Werk „dicht hinter Melanchthon und Calvin" gestellt, „indem es die evangelische Glaubenslehre, die jene Männer zuerst gestaltet, mit schöpferischem Geist umgestaltet und ihr zuerst den wissenschaftlichen Charakter aufgeprägt hat."

Die **Einleitung** stellt den **Begriff der Dogmatik,** sowie die **Methode** und Anordnung derselben fest. Die Dogmatik kann als theologische Disziplin lediglich auf die christliche Kirche ihre Beziehung haben. Von vornherein ist deshalb das Verfahren abzulehnen, von allgemeinen Prinzipien aus eine Lehre über Gott, den Menschen, die Unsterblichkeit aufzustellen. Die Theologie dient der Kirche Der Begriff der **Kirche** gehört der Ethik an, weil sie eine Gemeinschaft ist, die nur durch freie menschliche Handlungen entsteht und fortbesteht. Die Kirche hat ihre Basis in der **Frömmigkeit.** Diese ist weder ein Wissen, noch ein Tun, sondern eine Bestimmtheit des **Gefühls** oder des unmittelbaren **Selbstbewußtseins.** Hier knüpft Schleiermacher an seine **„Reden über die Religion"** an. Als echter Kantianer vertritt er die Ansicht, daß es kein Wissen um Gott geben kann, weil unser an Gegensätze gebundenes Denken in keinem

Begriff den zu fassen vermag, der über alle Gegensätze hinaus ist. Aber was das Wissen nicht erreichen kann, ist im unmittelbaren Selbstbewußtsein vorhanden, in dem einheitlichen Grund unsers Lebens, aus dem erst die Gegensätze unsers Wissens und Wollens hervorgehen. In diesem unmittelbaren Selbstbewußtsein ist das Gefühl **schlechthiniger Abhängigkeit** und in ihm das Bewußtsein Gottes mitgesetzt. Die religiösen Vorstellungen, die Ideen von Gott befriedigen nur das Bedürfnis, diesen Grund unsers Denkens vorzustellen und in einem freilich immer ungenügenden Bild anzuschauen.

Das bisherige nennt Schleiermacher Lehnsätze aus der Ethik. In „Lehnsätzen aus der Religionsphilosophie" bespricht er die verschiedenen Arten und Stufen der frommen Gemeinschaften. In „Lehnsätzen aus der Apologetik" aber wird sodann das Christentum seinem eigentlichen Wesen nach dahin bestimmt, daß alles in dieser Glaubensweise auf **die durch Jesum von Nazareth vollzogene Erlösung** bezogen wird. Die bestimmte Form des Lebens jeder religiösen Gemeinschaft geht auf einen geschichtlichen Anfangspunkt zurück, der, wie die Entstehung des Lebens überhaupt, nicht weiter zu erklären ist. Die christliche Gemeinde aber ist dadurch eine christliche, daß sie ihr Leben abhängig weiß von der historischen Erscheinung Christi, und daß dieses Leben immer aufs neue erzeugt wird durch das in ihr fortlebende Bild Christi. **Das Bewußtsein der Erlösung** durch Christus ist also der Mittelpunkt der christlichen Frömmigkeit. In den daran sich anschließenden Erörterungen über Wesen und Methode der Dogmatik erklärt Schleiermacher, daß die **christlichen Glaubenssätze** die christlich-frommen Gemütszustände aufzufassen und darzustellen haben. Wie das christliche Bewußtsein selbst aber ein geschichtliches geworden ist, so kann auch die Glaubenslehre, welche diese Zustände und Aussagen im Zusammenhang darstellt, nur die Wissenschaft von dem Zusammenhang der in einer christlichen Kirchengemeinschaft zu einer gegebenen Zeit geltenden Lehre sein; sie hat also geschichtlichen Charakter.

Ein **Einteilungsprinzip** für die Glaubenssätze gewinnt Schleiermacher durch die Erwägung, daß alle Glaubenssätze gefaßt werden können entweder als Beschreibungen menschlicher Lebenszustände oder als Begriffe von göttlichen Eigenschaften und Handlungsweisen (weil nämlich jede Bestimmtheit unsers Selbstbewußtseins auf ein Bestimmendes außerhalb desselben hinweist), oder als Aussagen von Beschaffenheiten der Welt (weil jenes Bestimmende auch immer als Teil des allgemeinen Weltzusammenhangs, in dem wir stehen, auftritt). Dies alles gehört zur „Einleitung."

Vorstehendes bedarf wohl eine nähere Erklärung. Dieses Werk ist ein dialektisches Kunstwerk genannt worden. Mit Recht! Es hat in der theologischen Literatur seines Jahrhunderts seinesgleichen

nicht gefunden, und aus der älteren kann es etwa nur mit Calvins „Institutio" verglichen werden. Es sind kurze Paragraphen, welche durch ausführliche Exkurse mit ununterbrochener Stetigkeit zu einem Ganzen verbunden werden. Erfunden hat der Verfasser, wie er selber sagt, die Einteilung und häufig auch die Bezeichnung; den ganzen übrigen Inhalt will er als einen empfangenen wiedergeben. Dadurch drückt er auch dem Bekannten und Oftgesagten den Stempel eines originalen Geistes auf. Nach Schleiermacher ist die Dogmatik keine rein erkennende, sie ist eine reflektierende Wissenschaft; sie ruht auf dem Gegebenen und soll über Gehalt und Zusammenhang einer historisch vorhandnen Glaubensweise, hier also der evangelisch-christlichen Frömmigkeit, eine kritisch geläuterte Rechenschaft geben, damit was die Frömmigkeit als unmittelbares Selbstbewußtsein in sich trägt, einer geordneten Lehrmitteilung und wissenschaftlichen Aneignung fähig werde. Denn ihr Wesen hat die Frömmigkeit eben im Gefühl, nicht im Wissen oder Tun, aber sie unterscheidet sich dadurch von jedem andern Gefühl, daß sie sich eines allbestimmenden Verhältnisses nicht zum Einzelnen und Besonderen, sondern zum Absoluten bewußt wird. Er definiert die Frömmigkeit als **„schlechthiniges Abhängigkeitsgefühl,"** um auszudrücken, daß sie um so reiner ihr Wesen erfaßt, je mehr sie sich über die Sphäre der Willkür und der irdischen Wechselwirkung erhebt und ganz in jene göttliche Notwendigkeit eingeht. Erst der christliche Monotheismus habe es vollständig offenbart. Schleiermacher wollte mit diesem Ausdruck das Tiefste im Menschen, nicht etwas Schwächliches und Untergeordnetes bezeichnen. Viele Theologen, nicht alle, haben ihm darin Recht gegeben, daß die Frömmigkeit in der Unmittelbarkeit des Bewußtseins ihren Sitz habe, auch darin, daß sie ein jede Gegenwirkung ausschließendes Abhängigkeitsgefühl sei, nur darin nicht, daß sie **bloßes** Abhängigkeitsgefühl sei. Die Vermittlung dieses Prinzips mit dem der Freiheit ist an dieser Stelle vermißt worden. Eine zweite Definition betrifft die eigentümlich **christliche** Frömmigkeit; dieselbe ist ebenso qualitativ als historisch zu bestimmen. In ersterer Beziehung ist alles christliche ein Allgemeines, ein erlösender Eintritt aus dem **sittlichen** Zustand der Unlust in den der Seligkeit und Lust, in der letzteren Beziehung ein Besonderes, nämlich Werk und Wirkung der **Erscheinung Christi.** Beide Richtungen müssen sich decken, wenn keine Ablösung des historischen von dem ideellen Bewußtsein entstehen soll, und aus ihrer Verbindung ergeben sich die Grenzen, aber auch die natürlichen Gefahren und Abwege, innerhalb deren die christliche Glaubensweise sich bewegt. Die Erlösung wird angetastet, sobald in der Beurteilung der menschlichen Kräfte die Möglichkeit oder auch die Notwendigkeit des Erlöstwerdens nicht mehr erhellt. Christus wird angetastet, sobald er dem menschlichen Leben zu wenig oder zu vollständig gleichstehend gedacht wird, um jene Wirkungen

auszuüben. So entstehen zwei christologische und zwei anthropologische Häresien, die ebionitische und die doketische, die pelagianische und die manichäische, und der Verfasser hat es nicht für nötig gehalten, aus der Auffassung des Gottesbegriffs zwei entgegenstehende Abweichungen etwa des Deistischen und des Pantheistischen herzuleiten, weil er in dem absoluten Abhängigkeitsgefühl selber eine hinreichende Bürgschaft sieht sowohl gegen falsche Trennung wie gegen falsche Vermischung und Identifizierung Gottes mit der Welt. Ein dritter Charakterzug tritt dadurch hinzu, daß jene erlösende Kraft nicht an das Medium der Kirche gebunden ist, sondern frei und ohne Abhängigkeit kirchlicher Dazwischenkunft von dem einzelnen angeeignet werden kann. Damit wäre aber kein Häretisches gemeint, sondern nur ein Konfessionelles treffend hervorgehoben, welches die Scheidewand der evangelischen Auffassung gegen die katholische Kirche bildet. Diese Grundsätze werden dem einzelnen Dogmatiker schon aus der evangelischen Glaubensgemeinschaft zugefügt; was er selber zu leisten hat, ergibt sich aus der Natur des wissenschaftlichen Vortrags, sowie aus dem Prinzip einer fortschreitenden Schrift- und Geschichtserkenntnis. Er hat an das historisch Ausgeprägte überall anzuknüpfen, zunächst an die symbolischen Zeugnisse, welche selbst wieder an die Schriftnorm, zumal des Neuen Testaments (denn das Alte ist nur eine sekundäre und im Grunde überflüssige Autorität!) zurückweisen; aber diese Abhängigkeit wird wieder zur Freiheit, und indem er aus der Vergangenheit und dem bisherigen Gang der Theologie auch deren Zukunft begreift und vermutet, wird er diese auch seinerseits selbsttätig herbeizuführen suchen. Die Prüfung und Sichtung des gegenwärtigen Standes ist zugleich Divination dessen, was die Zukunft bringen oder berichtigen soll.

Die **Idee der Erlösung** bildet nach Schleiermacher den Mittelpunkt der evangelischen Frömmigkeit. Aber nicht alle Aussagen des christlichen Bewußtseins enthalten diese Idee; einige gehen ihr notwendig voran, während andere unmittelbar auf sie gerichtet oder an sie angeknüpft werden müssen, weil sie mit dem Gefühl der Sünde und dem Bedürfnis der Wiederherstellung behaftet sind. . . . Auf jedem Standpunkt der christlichen Frömmigkeit verbindet sich mit dem ersten unmittelbaren Ausdruck des Selbstbewußtseins auch zweitens ein Wissen der **Welt** und drittens ein Wissen **Gottes**, d. h. der jenem Selbstbewußtsein entsprechenden höchsten Kausalität, also der göttlichen Eigenschaften.

Dies genüge bezüglich der berühmten Einteilung. Die **Glaubenslehre** entwickelt dann Schleiermacher in zwei Teilen. In dem ersten derselben, der der schwierigere ist, hat die kritische Reflexion, in dem zweiten die dogmatische Ausprägung und der freie Anschluß an die kirchlichen Bestimmungen das Uebergewicht, beides innerhalb der gesteckten Grenzen. In dem ersten behandelt er demnach die Ent-

wicklung des frommen Selbstbewußtseins, wie es in jeder christlich frommen Gemütserregung immer schon vorausgesetzt wird, aber auch immer wieder enthalten ist. In dem zweiten Teil werden die Tatsachen des frommen Selbstbewußtseins entwickelt, wie sie durch den Gegensatz von Sünde und Gnade bestimmt sind. Man fand diese Einteilung anfechtbar, da nach Schleiermachers Lehre selbst das christliche Selbstbewußtsein immer durch die Idee der Erlösung bestimmt wird; nach ihm erkennen wir Gott nur durch Christus; also ist auch die Vorausnahme des ersten Hauptteils nicht gerechtfertigt. Und Schleiermacher selbst scheint sich dieses Verstoßes gegen die strenge Folgerichtigkeit bewußt gewesen zu sein, wie anderweitige Aeußerungen erweisen; er folgte eben hier dem Herkommen. Doch dies tut dem Werke keinen Abbruch.

Von der Selbständigkeit des christlichen Gottesbewußtseins ausgehend, weist er die sog. Beweise für das Dasein Gottes aus der Dogmatik aus. Er lehrt, daß die Welterhaltung unmittelbare, die Weltschöpfung nur mittelbare Aussage des Glaubens sei. Hierbei entwickelt er die reinsten Anschauungen und verdient das „Lob dogmatischer Enthaltsamkeit," indem er dafür sorgt, die Dogmatik mit den Resultaten der Naturwissenschaft weder zu belasten noch in Konflikt zu bringen. Dazu bemerkt ein Kritiker: „Kein Vorgänger hat dieselbe Bescheidenheit geübt, und doch hat es sich nachmals ergeben und ergibt sich noch, daß nur sie der Theologie nach dieser Richtung zum Heil dienen kann."

Die Kritik Schleiermachers an der Engel- und Teufelslehre hat bekanntlich großes Aufsehen erregt, sie zeigt zugleich, daß der buchstäbliche Schriftbeweis keine genügende Gewalt über ihn gehabt hat. Mit Recht kann man gegen seine Engel- und Teufelslehre einwenden, daß es noch kein Grund ist, das Dasein der Engel als problematisch hinzustellen, weil „gegenwärtig das fromme Gefühl von Engeln nichts zu sagen wisse," da sie doch in der biblischen und altkirchlichen Frömmigkeit eine wichtige Stelle einnehmen. Und heißt es nicht, der Bibel Gewalt antun, wollte man das Dasein und die Tätigkeit der Engel leugnen, und dies gilt von dem Alten wie von dem Neuen Testament. Schleiermacher beruft sich auch darauf, daß selbst in der Heiligen Schrift das Interesse mit andern Glaubenszwecken geltend gemacht werde. Die Vorstellung des **Teufels** bezeichnet Schleiermacher als haltungslos: der Fall der Engel sei undenkbar, weil er sein eignes Motiv immer zur Voraussetzung habe, daß die dem Satan beigelegte völlige Bosheit sich mit seiner angeblichen höchsten Klugheit innerlich nicht vertrage, daß die Erklärung des Bösen durch ihn nicht erleichtert, sondern zurückgeschoben werde usw. Diese Gründe sind beanstandet worden und nicht mit Unrecht; sie sind nicht unschwer alle zu widerlegen.

Die Behandlung der Lehre von der **Welterhaltung** verdient um ihrer kritischen Behutsamkeit willen Erwähnung. Die Distinktionen von Mitwirkung und Regierung und die Annahme eines besonderen Einwirkens neben dem allgemeinen dürfe nur mit Vorbehalt gelten. Die Erhaltung der Natur durch sich selber, welche die Wissenschaft nachweist, darf die Religion weder leugnen, noch zerreißen oder zerstückeln wollen, sondern sie muß dabei stehen bleiben, daß der natürliche Zusammenhang sich mit der göttlichen Abhängigkeit vertrage und auf ihr ruhe. Das **Wunder** werde von der Frömmigkeit nicht in absolutem Sinn, so daß es den Naturnexus aufhebe, gefordert; freie und natürliche Bewegung, Gutes und Uebel, alle Hebel der Geschichte und Naturwirkung bedingten eine Reihe von Gegensätzen, welche von der Theologie ebenso aufrichtig anerkannt, wie mit sorglicher Dialektik behütet werden müßten, um den freien Rückgang auf das alleinige göttliche Prinzip offen zu lassen.

Das **dritte** Bild, in welchem die allgemeine Richtung der Frömmigkeit sich ausprägen müsse, entfernt sich nach Schleiermachers Darstellung noch weiter von der populären Ansicht. Wenn das Gottesbewußtsein von dem Umfang und der Art des Weltbestandes auf das Prinzip der Abhängigkeit zurückblicken und es aus den Formen des endlichen Daseins erläutern und beleuchten will, so entstehen **göttliche Eigenschaften.** Ihr logischer Grund sei die Kausalität, weil Gott absolute Wirkung sei; alle andern Kategorien hätten nur ergänzende Bedeutung. Die göttliche Kausalität sei dem Umfang nach der endlichen gleich, also **Allmacht,** der Art nach jeder zeitlichen Abfolge, an welche die irdischen Dinge gebunden sind, entgegengesetzt, also **Ewigkeit.** Sie könne aber auch als **Allwissenheit** und **Allgegenwart** ausgesprochen werden, dieses um sie zugleich von den räumlichen Schranken auszuschließen, jenes damit sie als eine absolut lebendige und bewußte gedacht werde. Das ist jedenfalls eine ausgezeichnete Gruppe von Distinktionen, die Schleiermacher einzig eigen sind.

Gehen wir dann, manches andere, das sich aus dem soeben Dargestellten entwickelt, übergehend, zum zweiten Teil Schleiermachers Glaubenslehre über. In diesem hat die dogmatische Ausprägung und der freie Anschluß an die kirchlichen Bestimmungen das Uebergewicht. Dieser zweite Hauptteil hat viele Verehrer gefunden, die dem ersten weniger hold sind; er unterscheidet sich durch positiveren Charakter, durch liebevolle Hingebung an die historischen Erscheinungen, sowie er auch in zahlreichen Einschnitten und Ruhepunkten mehr Abwechslung gewährt. Wer kennt nicht Schleiermachers Entwicklung, welche das dogmatische Mysterium von der **Erbsünde** zu einem psychologisch nachweisbaren und historisch anzuerkennenden Faktor ausbildet? Die Erklärung der Erbsünde lautet wörtlich orthodox; sie ist ihm vollkommene Unfähigkeit zum Guten,

abgesehen von der Fähigkeit, die Erlösung in sich aufzunehmen, wird dem natürlichen Menschen jede wahre Gerechtigkeit abgesprochen und nur die bürgerliche Tugend zuerkannt; ja der Verfasser räumt ein, daß die symbolischen Bücher Grund haben, die Erbsünde, weil sie sofort mit Momenten der Verschuldung erwächst, zugleich als **Erbschuld** zu betrachten. Dagegen kann die kirchliche Annahme eines **Sündenfalls** durch **Naturverderbtheit** nur auf populäre Wahrheit Anspruch machen. Die **Sünde** ist die durch die Selbständigkeit der sinnlichen Funktionen verursachte Hemmung der bestimmenden Kraft des Geistes, das Unvermögen des Geistes. Sie ist teils in uns selber begründet, teils hat sie ihren Grund jenseits unsers eignen Daseins. So wird sie ein durchaus Gemeinschaftliches.

An die Lehre von der Sünde schließt sich die vom **Uebel** an. Uebel sind die Lebenshemmungen, welche der Mensch infolge der Sünde erfährt. Es gibt gesellige und natürliche Uebel, welche nur durch die Unkräftigkeit des Gottesbewußtseins als solche empfunden werden. Daran schließen sich an die göttlichen Eigenschaften der Heiligkeit und Gerechtigkeit. Des Gegensatzes andere Seite entwickelt sodann das **Bewußtsein der Gnade.** In dem Bewußtsein der **Erlösung** oder der Annäherung zur Seligkeit weiß man sich als Glied eines auf Jesus von Nazareth zurückführenden Gesamtlebens. Jesu Wirksamkeit teilt uns dessen unsündliche Vollkommenheit mit. Die **Person Jesu** läßt sich nicht von seinem Werke trennen. Im Gegenteil wird die Würde der Person nur an seinem eigentümlichen Werke anschaulich gemacht. Was die Person Jesu betrifft, schließt sich Schleiermacher an die überlieferten symbolischen Bestimmungen in drei Lehrsätzen an: 1. Vereinigung der göttlichen und menschlichen Natur in der **einen** Person Christi; 2. Verhältnis der beiden Naturen zueinander, welches sich dahin bestimmt, daß bei der Vereinigung die göttliche Natur allein die tätige, während des Vereintseins aber die Tätigkeit beider eine gemeinsame war; 3. Unterschied Christi von den übrigen Menschen, bestehend in einer **Sündlosigkeit,** welche mit dem „potuit non peccare" zugleich ein „non potuit peccare" in sich schließt und religiöse Irrtumsfreiheit. Aus der Erklärung dieser Lehrsätze ergibt sich ein Gottmensch in religiösem Sinn, ein Schöpfer und Urbild des christlichen Gottesbewußtseins, ein göttlicher Menschensohn von relativ übernatürlicher Erhabenheit und Wirkungskraft, ein zweiter Adam, welcher die Menschheit ebensowohl neu eröffnet, wie er auch das Ziel ihrer Vollendung durch sich selber offenbart hat. Schleiermacher verhehlt nicht, daß die obigen Lehrsätze, wenigstens die beiden ersteren, schwierig bleiben und die Prüfung nicht ganz bestehen. Der Schleiermachersche Christus — und der Dogmatiker war sich dessen bewußt, — ist nicht mehr der kosmisch-metaphysische Gottmensch, welchen die Kirchenlehre unter Voraussetzung der Trinität und Homousie

behauptet (und den die biblische christliche Frömmigkeit glaubt und verehrt), die „göttliche Natur" ist nur der passendste Name für die unbeschreibliche Stärke und Reinheit seiner Gottgemeinschaft, seine Persönlichkeit zwar nicht den Mängeln, aber doch den Grenzen der irdischen Erscheinung zugewiesen. Ein **vormenschliches** Dasein Christi im **persönlichen** Sinn anzunehmen, ist keine religiöse Nötigung vorhanden, noch scheint das Schriftzeugnis durchgängig ein solches zu fordern. Das Unterscheidende des Wesens Christi, wovon der erlösende Geist ausgeht und worauf der Glaube ruht, ist aber selber ein Innerliches und Geistiges, darf also an äußere Merkmale, sei es nun historischer oder physischer Art, nicht notwendig geheftet werden. Die **übernatürliche Erzeugung** ist kein Glaubenssatz, und das kritische Urteil über die auf sie bezüglichen Bibelstellen muß frei bleiben. Und das ist eine Ansicht, welche auch Exegeten der streng positiven Richtung teilen.

Berühmt sind die Formeln über das **Werk Christi**: Er nimmt die Gläubigen in die Kräftigkeit seines Gottesbewußtseins auf, das ist seine **erlösende** Tätigkeit. Er nimmt sie in die Gemeinschaft seiner ungetrübten Seligkeit auf, das ist seine **versöhnende** Tätigkeit. Wirksam ist das Bild Christi nur durch Vermittlung der gläubigen Gemeinde. Die **Erlösung** ist effektive Befreiung von der herrschenden Sünde. Sie umfaßt also auch die Wiedergeburt und die Heiligung. Die Wirkung, die von Christus ausgeht, ist ihrem Anfang nach übernatürlich, ihrer Erscheinung nach natürlich-geschichtlich. Schleiermacher will gestatten, daß man diese Wirkung eine mystische nenne, sie sei aber wohl eher als eine ästhetische zu bezeichnen. Die versöhnende Tätigkeit äußert sich im Gefolg der erlösenden. Die Hauptsache an der Versöhnung ist, daß der Zusammenhang zwischen Uebel und Sünde aufgehoben wird. Die Uebel werden nicht mehr als Strafe empfunden, sondern als Reize für das Gottesbewußtsein. Bei der erlösenden und versöhnenden Tätigkeit Jesu zieht Schleiermacher das Leiden Christi absichtlich nicht in Betracht, ebenso wenig die Auferstehung und Himmelfahrt, welche nach ihm nicht als eigentliche Bestandteile der Lehre von seiner Person aufgestellt werden können.

Ueber die **Erwählungslehre** hatte Schleiermacher schon 1819 eine bedeutsame Schrift geschrieben, die für die Unionsbewegung wichtig wurde. Die Erwählung derer, die gerechtfertigt werden, folgt nach ihm aus der göttlichen Weltordnung. Unmöglich folgt daraus ein Urteil über endgiltige und unbedingte Verwerfung einzelner. Bedenkt man die menschliche Freiheit, so ergibt sich, daß die Erwählung begründet ist in dem vorhergesehenen Glauben der Erwählten.

Der **Heilige Geist**, welcher die im Stande der Heiligung Lebenden beseelt, ist der Gemeingeist der Kirche. An der **Kirche** ist

das Zeugnis von Christo lebendig in der **Heiligen Schrift** und es beruht in ihr die Anknüpfung und Erhaltung der Lebensgemeinschaft mit Christo auf den Anordnungen Christi, wie er sie über die **Taufe** und das **heilige Abendmahl** gegeben hat; endlich ist in ihr der gegenseitige Einfluß des Ganzen auf den einzelnen und des einzelnen auf das Ganze geordnet im **Amt der Schlüssel** und im **Gebet im Namen Jesu.** Von der **Vollendung der Kirche handeln** die vier prophetischen Lehrstücke von der Wiederkunft Christi, der Auferstehung des Fleisches, dem jüngsten Gericht und der ewigen Seligkeit. Die Darstellung von der Vollendung der Kirche könne nur den Nutzen eines Vorbildes haben, dem wir uns nähern sollen. Der Glaube an das Fortbestehen der menschlichen Persönlichkeit sei enthalten in dem Glauben an die Unveränderlichkeit der Vereinigung des göttlichen Wesens mit der menschlichen Natur in der Person Jesu. Die göttlichen Eigenschaften, welche sich auf die Erlösung beziehen, sind die **Liebe** und die **Weisheit** Gottes.

Den Beschluß des Ganzen macht die **„göttliche Dreiheit."** Die Trinität biete keine unmittelbare Aussage des christlichen Bewußtseins dar, noch bilde sie für sich allein ein Glied des ursprünglichen Glaubens; deshalb fehle ihr innerlich das Wesen eines selbständigen Dogmas, welches ihr von der Kirche später beigelegt wurde. Richtig verstanden spreche diese Dreiheit nicht die Gottheit, sondern die christliche Offenbarung aus, und sie gehöre ans Ende, weil in ihr die drei Namen, auf welche die Offenbarung des Reiches Gottes zurückweise, und insofern der kurze Inhalt alles zuvor Mitgeteilten zusammengefaßt werde.

Eine Kritik der einzelnen Lehrsätze Schleiermachers wird wohl kein Leser erwarten. Der zur Verfügung gestellte Raum wäre viel zu gering. Daher nur folgende Bemerkungen im allgemeinen: Indem Schleiermacher den Rationalismus und den Supernaturalismus seiner Zeit überwand, hat er der Theologie neue Bahnen gewiesen. Er hat das Gebiet des wissenschaftlichen Erkennens, welchem das Endliche erreichbar ist, und das Gebiet der religiösen Gewißheit klar voneinander geschieden und den Sitz der letzteren in dem innersten Grund unsrer Seele aufgezeigt. Seine **Hauptschwäche** ist die ästhetische Auffassung des religiösen Lebens. Dies zeigen nicht nur seine „Reden über die Religion," sondern auch in seiner Glaubenslehre tritt bei der Lehre von der Sünde und von der Erlösung die ästhetische Betrachtungsweise in den Vordergrund und verdunkelt den teleologischen und **ethischen** Charakter des Evangeliums. Dazu ist seine dogmatische Methode nicht ohne innere Widersprüche. Und daraus erklärt es sich, daß die von ihm beeinflußten Theologen so ganz verschiedene Bahnen einschlagen konnten. Einerseits soll die Glaubenslehre als historische Wissenschaft die in der Kirche geltende Lehre darstellen, wobei übrigens die Eigentümlichkeit des Darstellen-

den sowie die Zeitanschauungen berichtigend mitwirken sollen. Anderseits soll die Glaubenslehre die durch die Beziehung auf den Erlöser als geschichtlich bestimmten frommen Gemütszustände darstellen, aber in jedem solchen soll auch ein nicht spezifisch christliches Bewußtsein von Gott und Welt enthalten sein. So war es möglich, daß streng kirchliche wie liberale Theologen Schleiermachersche Gedanken aufnahmen und dieselben erst recht zu deuten und fortzubilden glaubten. Ein großes Verdienst erwarb sich Schleiermacher, daß er die **Religion als Christentum,** darum aber auch das **Christentum als Religion** entschieden betrachtet haben wollte. Mögen seinem Werke auch Unklarheiten und bedenkliche Auffassungen anhaften, er hat sich großes Verdienst um die kirchliche Theologie erworben, er bleibt unser großer Theologe.

EDITORIALS

REMINISCENCES

I am going to be very personal in this article. In a former editorial I made reference to the fact that, some time ago, I rounded out the scriptural three score years and ten. If life is prolonged beyond that limit, then, according to the psalmist, it is a special gift of divine grace. So, since the end may loom up within measurable distance, it is natural to review some of the incidents and experiences of the past. The readers of the "Magazine", I trust, will not object for I have been on terms of intimacy with them for seventeen years and the present year will bring my opportunities along that line to a close.

1. This is the year 1879 and I, a boy, fifteen years of age, with fifty-three others, am attending the confirmation class in the house of Pastor Braun, the religious teacher of the "Gymnasium" of a city in Westphalia. He is the best representative of Lutheran Pietism I ever met, and, at the same time, a scholar of note and a "Seelenfuehrer" (Tersteegen) par excellence. He had been teaching us a portion of the Lutheran catechism—but now he is getting very personal and speaking about the sins that beset the boys of our age. I listened with rapt attention; more, I felt as though I was standing before the inner sanctuary and that only genuine repentance would permit me to cross its threshold. I followed the minister into his study, after class, and there, with only God and him as witnesses, I unburdened my soul. I shall never forget the kindness and gentleness with which he led me to the throne of grace.—After the interview, as I was going home, I seemed to be treading on air. Never had I been so conscious of the presence of God, never had my soul been so flooded with happiness. I remember when afterwards I came into my room, which I shared with a friend, how I sat there a long time in wordless detachment, praying that I might never lose the precious pearl of divine fellowship.

From that time on I believed that there was not another man of God like Pastor Braun; and so did hundreds of other boys. When years later Braun was called to Berlin as General Superintendent of a church province, he said in his farewell sermon: "How often have I in these latter weeks been looking at my stove, thinking 'if that stove could talk!' How many confessions of sin that came to me in the mail it has swallowed! Well, there will be such a stove in my parsonage at Berlin." How skilfully he blended in that

statement the cordial invitation to call on his help with the assurance that such confidences would never fall into the hands of strangers.

While at that institution, I naturally formed friendships with several young men, but only one that stood the test of time and distance. One day we noticed a striking looking boy in the class, who had entered long after the school year had started. It was Walter Rauschenbusch from Rochester, N. Y. His father was professor in a Baptist seminary in that city; but having been born in Germany he sent his son to the land of his birth to have him well grounded in the "humanities". For three years two others and I lived with Rauschenbusch in the same house. We got to love the young American dearly and felt the superiority of his intellect and personality plainly although we would not have admitted it. Even for the teachers it was a somewhat hard decision to make the American "primus omnium" when arriving at the highest class. Incidentally, he helped me with the English language, teaching me to pronounce the th, to roll the r's, and other linguistic finesses. Little did I know then that the time would come when these instructions would stand me in good stead. Still less, however, did anyone of us imagine that this young American, with the straight and towering brow and the deep set eyes, would in a few short years become one of the most challenging leaders of American Protestantism. When I came to America Rauschenbusch at once greeted me with the most sincere good will and tried to help me in every way. Our friendship never had an interruption. In the last letter I have from him he told me that the War had broken his heart and that he could never be happy again in this world. A short time later he passed away.

2. It is now 1891 and I am the pastor of a church near Quincy, Ill. It is composed of about thirty farmer families and they pay me three hundred dollars a year. The church is a plain, ugly frame building, in a poor state of repair. When I am in the pulpit and raise my arm in a lively gesture, I have to be careful not to knock the plaster off the ceiling, for it is already cracked in many places. Church attendance is good but some of the farmers are apt to fall asleep during the sermon. There is especially one old deacon, a very pious and dignified looking man. He is the champion sleeper of them all and snores audibly while I am speaking. The psalm says, "the Lord giveth his beloved sleep", but would that apply to the church sleepers?

On the whole I feel pretty happy in this little congregation. When I stand before them on Sunday morning, I know every one. It seems to me I am facing just one family. So different from

"over there". There the church is just a place for worship, but not a social center. Of course, one knows they are all supposed to be members of Christ's body, they are all brethren, but you can't realize it when there are so many of all ages and stations and you hardly know their names.

3. From this place we—I have a wife and little daughter now—move to a place in southwestern Missouri. The "unforgettable" Max Habecker had been there. He was a charming man, a great storyteller, a social genius; besides a choir leader. I am nothing of all these things. They have a men's choir there, which is supposed to be the backbone of the congregation. When they have their first rehearsal they put the baton in my hand. I have to lead, nolens-volens. Pretty soon they notice that I can't lead. They are disappointed. Then the choir members have their birthday parties. nice little social affairs, with a keg of "Gerstensaft" on tap. I don't go to these gatherings; perhaps it was a mistake. At any rate, these men feel the minister lacks the social graces, he can't unbend as well as their former leader had done. They measure their present minister by the standards of the former. He can preach—they grant that—but preaching isn't everything. These men are now against me; they are working for a change. We have a congregational meeting. I have a large majority on my side, but, nevertheless, I am for a change of scene. A pleasant opportunity offers. I move on—to one of the most satisfactory places I ever had. Yes, I will say this for Boonville, Mo., they treated their minister decently. They did then and I suppose they have kept up their reputation ever since.

4. In 1901 we are in southeastern Ohio in one of the oldest of our congregations in the state. They have just introduced the English in the evening services. I had enrolled, a year before, at McCormick Seminary to get acquainted with English American church life and with the English itself. But the transition was hard. I'll never forget the first evening service I had. I was sitting in the chair behind the altar and the congregation was singing an English song. To me it seemed so strange. I said to myself, I'll never get accustomed to this. I always will feel as though I was walking on stilts instead of the natural way, when I am preaching English. Sometimes I had a hard struggle in the pulpit when thoughts and language wouldn't come. But the congregation bore with me, and in time I got over the strangeness and the difficulties.

I stayed here a number of years. My success was nothing startling. It was about as good as that of other ministers, of the older, conservative type. The young fellows who have been coming out of the seminary in these latter years are more aggressive, seems to me, in their methods. They are not remarkable in their pulpit

work but they are after *results* in regard to membership, in organization work, in Sunday school activities. They believe in and practise publicity. Even the small churches have their weekly bulletin and their monthly "Visitor" or "Echo". The modern minister even in our Church tries to be in touch with the public as much as possible. He joins the lodges, is on the program at the festivities of benevolent and social societies, and in all these ways he endeavors to increase his audience and to make himself and his church popular.

Not so the minister of the past. As a rule he confined himself to preaching, teaching and visiting his members. At any rate, that was the program of those who got their training in German universities and had made a beginning of pastoral work in the old country. I myself belong in this class and so I can speak freely and frankly of the actual facts. The training for the ministerial work one receives over there is little fitted to enable one to have a successful career here. A man who comes here steeped in the German atmosphere and accustomed to the habits and viewpoints of the pastor of the "Landeskirche", will always find it hard to adjust himself to life and work in the church of this country. There are of course exceptions. The names of Adolph Baltzer, Pastor Hartmann (of Chicago), Dr. Zimmermann (also of Chicago and noted in other fields of labor), Dr. Pister (General Superintendent) and a few others will readily spring to mind. The great majority, however, did not achieve signal prominence. Men like Nollau, Rieger and other leaders of the Synod came from German Mission houses, where training and outlook were entirely different from the University standards. They were not scholars, but pastors and active workers. They knew they had to make their fields themselves and were ready for such activities as would lead to practical results. The German minister preaches to a congregation that is already there. He never thinks of increasing the number of its members, only of reaching them that are already in the fold.

Furthermore, the German-trained minister is not so apt to cultivate the "winning smile", the deferential attitude towards the public as does the American minister. The preacher as well as the politician here must be pleasant personalities if they want to succeed. They train themselves deliberately along these lines and their success as ministers depends on their captivating exterior and manners. All this striving for popularity may be disgusting to the European mind but it accomplishes not a little when found in a man of sincere purpose and genuine love of man kind.

The young brethren who followed me in the ministry of the congregation I am speaking of, discovered possibilities for growth

that I had never tapped. There followed a period of expansion for which I give them considerable credit.

5. It is 1919 now, the War is just over. I spent the anxious four years of its duration at Coshocton, Ohio. I could say a great deal of our experiences during that memorable epoch when our government was engaged in a war in which we did not believe. But we must not try your patience too much; we must remember that this is not a complete autobiography of the writer.

We are in Cleveland and our son had just returned from the conflict, hale and hearty. Thank God, he never had to kill anyone. Our eldest daughter also had come home from the Pacific coast for an extended visit. We were all united and felt very happy. In the choice of the congregation we had been very fortunate. With Peter, we felt like saying, "Lord it is well for us to be here, let us build tabernacles". We did build a "tabernacle" for the Lord, a beautiful new sanctuary during my pastorate there. For many years we would have declared that there were few congregations where a pastor could work with so much pleasure as in ours. If finally the scriptural "fly in the ointment" was discovered anyhow, what else could have been expected when the imperfections of the minister clash with those of the congregation.

In 1921 Dr. Dibelius, member of the Prussian "Ober-Kirchenrat", came over to get in touch with our Synod and enlist our cooperation in the task of rebuilding the "waste places" in the fatherland. I owe him a great deal. He was a theologian no less than a high administrative official, a stimulating conversationalist and a quick observer; in a word, an altogether unusual personality. He was greatly interested in the American church system and had an eye for its good and weak points. He suggested to me to write a book in which the contrast between the German kind of church and our kind in this country would find adequate treatment. He even gave me a title and I accepted it. As a result, some time later, I began to carry out this plan in writing my "Geschichte des Religioesen Lebens in der Deutschen Evangelischen Synode von N. A." The eight months which I spent in the actual work of writing were a delight to me and of the greatest benefit. I got an insight into the history and genius of our Church I had not had before. Of course, the book was in German. If I had to write it now it would be in English and thus a longer period of popularity and usefulness would be assured to it.

In January 1923 the "Theological Magazine" observed its Fiftieth Anniversary. In connection with this the theological Faculty of the Giessen University, Germany, conferred on me the

degree of Doctor of Divinity. Naturally I was a little elated over this. I not only made a very full mention of it in the "Magazine" but I wanted my congregation also to share with me the honor and the joy. So I had the document framed and hung it up in the basement of the church, so that the women of the Ladies' Aid and the men of the Brotherhood and perhaps some of the church-goers on Sunday morning should read and appreciate it. But what do you think was the result, how many availed themselves of the opportunity thus granted them? You will be surprised to hear that as far as I observed not one took any notice of it! No, we must qualify this statement. There was one, but *only one,* one of the leaders in the congregation, he saw the document hanging on the wall, stepped up to it, read it in part and said: "Well, pretty nice!" That was all. After that I took the thing down again and hung it in my study so that at least my own eyes could feast themselves on it, seeing that the rest of the world passed it by with indifference.

The churches here—at least ours— take absolutely no interest in the scholarly pursuits of their minister, nor in the academic recognition and titles he may be able to get. We notice that here lately our calendar lists a great many pastors with the D.D. or other titles of distinction. It did not use to be that way. I remember the time when *Dr. John* (the father of the Chicago brother John) was the only "Doctor" in the Synod. Now we have many but the congregations care for none of these things. They don't raise your salary nor do they come to church more. One of our old German ladies said, "What does he call himself "doctor" for? He is not a physician."

If the people showed a different attitude, if at least the younger members learned to appreciate sound learning, the pastor would feel encouraged to devote more time to real study. I used to spend a great deal of time on exegetical studies as a young minister. There isn't a book in the Bible that I did not go through with a commentary at my side. I wish I had kept it up, but there was too little encouragement. Besides, of course, there are so many other things that a person has to read, other than exegesis. Nevertheless, I am glad and grateful that personal interest and later the work on the "Magazine" have kept me in touch with theological thought and interest. The "Social Gospel" which has come to the front so decidedly in the last twenty-five years, was first forced on my attention by Rauschenbusch's book on "The Church and the Social Crisis", in 1907. I have tried since then to give it an important place on my program, though it does not seem likely now that the Social Gospel is going to bring the Kingdom of God as fast as some imagined.

Was kann das bißchen Wasser helfen?

Einer unsrer älteren Pastoren hatte kürzlich eine Amtshandlung. Es war eine Taufe, eine „Haustaufe." Alles war bereit zum Beginn der feierlichen Handlung. Der Pastor war im Begriff, in das Zimmer zu treten, wo die Taufe stattfinden sollte. Da flüsterte ihm seine Gattin zu, die Tochter hätte gerade zu ihr — der Pfarrfrau — gesagt: „Was kann das bißchen Wasser auf den Kopf nützen?" Man kann sich denken, was für einen störenden, ja niederdrückenden Eindruck eine solche Bemerkung auf den Pfarrer machen mußte. Ein Wort der Skepsis, ja des Unglaubens gerade zu dieser Zeit! Und seine eigene Tochter unter den Zweifelnden, ja beinahe Spöttern, während die kleine Taufgesellschaft doch das Kind durch Nacht und Kälte gebracht hatten, damit es des Segens der Taufe teilhaftig werde. Nichtsdestoweniger schritt er mit der Taufhandlung weiter, obwohl er deutlich fühlte, daß das verhängnisvolle Wort ihm die Flügel der Seele gelähmt hatte.

Selbstverständlich fiel ihm sofort das Wort Luthers bezüglich der Taufe ein: „Wie kann denn schlecht Wasser solch große Dinge tun?" mit der Antwort: „Schlecht Wasser tut es freilich nicht, sondern der Glaube, der solchem Wort Gottes in der Taufe traut." Hätte die Taufe in der Kirche stattgefunden, so wäre es ihm leichter gewesen, an die segensreiche Wirkung der Taufe nicht nur zu glauben, sondern sie auch zu fühlen. Die ganze andachtsvolle Umgebung würde dann ihren psychologischen Effekt gehabt haben. Aber nun geschah alles im Wohnzimmer, im Beisein von drei oder vier Personen. Zwar heißt es: „Wo zwei oder drei versammelt sind in meinem Namen, da bin ich mitten unter ihnen," aber es ist doch besser, wenn zwei oder dreihundert sich im Gotteshaus versammeln. Das ganze Ereignis brachte es ihm wieder lebhaft ins Gemüt, was für ein unbefriedigender Notbehelf die Haustaufen sind.

Und noch ganz besonders, wenn solche nicht im Pfarrhaus, sondern in Privathäusern stattfinden. Da kommt der Pastor in das Haus, wo die Taufgesellschaft versammelt ist und findet den Raum vielleicht von Tabaksqualm erfüllt, und in vielen Fällen stehen schon die Wein- oder Bierflaschen umher. Oder wenn das nicht, so fehlen sie doch nachher nicht. Wie schwer da die passende Stimmung zu erzeugen und im Gang zu erhalten! Kein Wunder deshalb, daß die Pastoren sich so für **Kirchentaufen** ins Zeug werfen. Die Taufe ist doch Aufnahme in die Gemeinde; da sollte die Gemeinde zugegen sein. Und die Gegenwart der Gemeinde am heiligen Ort bürgt für die passende Seelenverfassung und macht die Symbolik der Taufe leichter verständlich.

Es ist freilich auch wichtig, daß man von der Taufe richtige Gedanken habe, daß man sie einerseits nicht zu einer bloß äußerlichen Form herabdrücke und anderseits keine magische Wirkung erwarte. Die Mehrzahl der Eltern, die Kinder zur Taufe bringen, folgen wohl bloß einer alten Sitte, mit dem halb unbewußten Gefühl, daß es für das Kind gut sein dürfte zur Taufe gebracht zu werden. Es ist Sache des Pastors, entweder mit Benutzung des Taufformulars, oder durch die Taufrede die Bedeutung der Taufe ins rechte Licht zu stellen; so nämlich, daß nach Christi deutlichem und tröstlichem Wort das Kind ins Reich Gottes gehört, und daß es der Eltern Pflicht ist, es so zu erziehen durch Lehre und Vorbild, daß es als ein Kind Gottes heranwächst. Man wird dieser Auffassung entgegen halten, daß dann die Taufe hauptsächlich etwas **für die Eltern** bedeute. Wir geben das auch willig zu. Das Kind versteht nichts von dem, was der Pastor sagt und tut. Die Eltern verstehen es, und wenn sie das tun, was sie bei der Taufe versprechen, nämlich das Kind aufziehen in der Furcht Gottes und im Glauben an Christus, so wird die Taufe auch für das Kind, **in ihrer Folge,** große Bedeutung haben.

Manchen wird diese Auslegung der Taufhandlung nicht genügen. Sie werden fortfahren zu glauben, daß in der Taufe in das Kind **der Keim** eines **neuen Lebens** gepflanzt werde (wenn sie nicht gar so weit gehen zu betonen, es sei eine Taufe der tatsächlichen **Wiedergeburt**). Auch unser Katechismus sagt, daß die Kinder (die Täuflinge) **ebenso gut imstande seien das neue Leben zu empfangen als die Erwachsenen.** Wir können uns diese Auffassung nicht aneignen. Zu glauben, daß in der Taufe das Kind, das nichts von der ganzen Handlung versteht, das neue Leben empfange, scheint uns eine **magische** Auffassung und Deutung der Taufe zu sein. Dem gegenüber halten wir uns an eine Auffassung, die weniger zu versprechen scheint, aber den Tatsachen mehr gerecht wird. Es ist besser, weniger zu verlangen und vorauszusetzen, aber auf dies wenige auch wirklich zu dringen, als scheinbar mehr zu erwarten und zu glauben, aber dann an der Durchführbarkeit oder an der Glaubmöglichkeit zu scheitern.

Aehnlich wie später bei der Konfirmation. Viele lassen da die Konfirmanden zu viel geloben und erinnern sie vielleicht daran, daß sie es „am jüngsten Tag verantworten müssen." Es wäre auch da besser, von den jungen Knaben und Mädchen weniger zu erwarten, aber dies wenige verständlich zu machen und es innerhalb des wirklich Durchführbaren zu halten.

The Christian World

Palmer and Barth

By George W. Richards

I have before me the address of President Palmer delivered at the opening session of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, December 6, 1933, in Washington, D. C. It is published in The Christian Century, December 20, 1933, under the heading: "The Eternal God and the Present Hour." I have had the rare privilege both of hearing and reading it. It is a masterpiece of clarity of thought and diction, worthy indeed of the notable occasion on which it was delivered—the keynote address at the celebration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the organization of the Federal council.

Before me also is one of the sermons in the recent English translation of a volume of sermons by Professor Barth and Pastor Thurneysen, entitled, in German, "Komm Schoepfer Geist"; in English, "Come Holy Spirit." The topic of the sermon is "Make Me Pure of Heart," and the text, "Blessed are the pure in heart for they shall see God."

After I had read the address and the sermon, I felt that they represented in popular discourse two outstanding trends of religious faith and theological thought at the present time—the modern liberal, and the Barthian critical theology. Without attempting a discussion of the underlying metaphysics, which has been done so often and thoroughly during the last decade, I shall try to set forth the things on which they agree and on which they differ in language that even the common man can understand.

The material of the address and the sermon may be grouped under the following headings: 1. The trouble of our time; 2. The remedy—God; 3. Where and how to find him.

The authors agree that the trouble is *godlessness;* that is, absence of God from the lives and affairs of men, or at least the failure of men to recognize his presence; that the remedy of the world's ills must be found in God; and that, if it is to be found, men must have both a distinctive way of access to God and a distinctive mode of action toward God. Both emphasize the reality, contemporaneousness and activity of God. He is here now. The question is, how can we know him, obtain access to him, and receive the benefits of his presence?

The Trouble of Our Time

Palmer finds "the peril of the present hour" in "godlessness" and the consequent absence of a world view without "inspiring power and central intelligence," of a moral code without divine sanction, of glowing hope and undergirding purpose, of the sense of reverence and awe "in the presence of eternal glory."

Barth speaks of the daily increasing distress and perplexity, symptoms of critical illness—of unemployment beyond control, of the collapse of the industrial order, of spiritual confusion, of many proposed remedies but none that cure the disease; as for example, the reform of the monetary system, a new method of education, a revival in the churches, in all of which we ought to take part in one way or another. He assumes that the distress will become worse, the fever mount higher, before men will find help. "Immediately after the affliction of those days"—the help will come.

The Remedy—God

With prophetic ardor Palmer announces that "a new sense of the reality and contemporaneousness of God is just about to burst upon the world." From what source? He expects "the philosophers and scientists to be the prophets and seers of this modern recovery of God." Among them he mentions Bergson, Whitehead, Streeter, Eddington, Wieman, Millikan and so on. These men assure us, in varying fashion, that the "universe is not a chaos," that "God is here, a contemporary fact and purpose, a power making for integration on ever higher and higher levels producing beauty, truth, intelligence, and moral law." God is defined in modern phrase as "emergent evolution, the elan vital, a principle of concretion, an integrating process, the sum of the personality-producing forces of the universe, the cosmic order."

This cosmic power is now at work and is accessible through chemical, biological, mathematical, personal, and sociological processes. The cosmos includes Jesus whom he defines as "poet's poet, wisdom's tongue —after all, the universe produced him!"

The inescapable living God is thus revealed not only in the vast cosmic order, but is also increasingly manifest in economic laws and social processes, in international relationships. God is "an immediately present reality behind the world in which we live." Therefore if we are in quest of God we shall find him through "social research" and the consecration of our lives to the high causes which this research brings to light. "This would be to find God on the altar of every struggle for better farming, better industry, better cities, better international relations." Palmer mentions neither the Old nor the New Testament as a way to God.

Barth expects no help from science or philosophy for the discovery of God. He directs men to the revelation of God in the Old and New Testaments. The supreme issue of the age and the remedy for its trouble is in God who has spoken in the past by the prophets and in these last days in his Son. Through them he speaks also to us, if we have an ear to hear an eye to see. "The help that really helps is great, strong, simple. It confronts us like a dark peaceful mountain ridge in the evening sky. I will lift up mine eyes unto the hills whence cometh my help." In an illuminating paragraph he defines his faith in God's help:

> *God helps*—this is the simple assurance. "If thou heal me Lord, I shall be whole." This is the help that appears to us far too plain. "We spin webs of air, practice many arts, and are moved farther from the goal."

God helps—this announcement shuts off all our discussions, makes all our movements superfluous, breaks up all our commissions and assemblies. It requires obedience; not enthusiasm. *God helps*—this commands silence, ends all attempts to help ourselves rather than to permit God to help us. By it, as Luther says, the head is taken from all our self-reliant will and deed. *God helps*—therefore we must get out of our complicated ways; come from behind the walls and towers of our notions and counsels; dismount from the high horse of our own viewpoints and convictions. *God helps*—this means that no thought of our brain, no counsel born of our wisdom, on the whole no advice, no act, no theory, no practice can help—God alone helps. *God helps*—but this in turn must not become advice which we give one another, a thought upon which we may light. *God helps*—humanly speaking this is meaningless because it reaches beyond all that is human. *God helps*—one can only understand this when one's eyes, far above all petition and reason, are opened for that which helps by him who helps.

Where and How to Find God

Palmer finds the cause for the "godless day" in the "confused and blurred thinking about God" due to "the changing cosmic ideas and the failure of the great mass of people to adjust their religious conceptions to the world order revealed by modern science." The one thing, therefore, that we must do to rediscover God is to adjust our thinking about God in the light of scientific discoveries; in other words, we must find him primarily in his operations in the universe about us and in the soul within us. This requires investigation and experimentation with things and persons as they now are. The root of the trouble is in erroneous thinking, and the way out is to be found through correct thinking about God.

We must work with him for the true, the beautiful, the good, for social justice. If it be granted that God is a living God actually present in the struggle for social betterment, "social research . . . becomes an inspiring quest to learn the will of God." The gospel that we are to proclaim, "the ringing message," is "that there is a God, that he is here, that we can know and feel the thrill of his mighty purpose for the world." We must "summon men to go out into all the issues and difficulties of the modern world as those who deal with sacred things and are fellow-workers with God." This message, it is claimed, will put "a new enthusiasm into religion and a church with such a message will go out with joy in spite of opposition, poverty, or even persecution."

Search the Heart, Not the Mind

Barth finds the cause for the "godless day" in the heart, rather than in the intellect, of man. "We are too spiritually rich," he says, "too wise, too gifted, not to desire any other knowledge than that God helps." We must come to the end of our own devices, ways of helping ourselves, or even of letting God help us. "We are still not poor enough, not humble enough, to permit the Psalmist's assurance that God is our helper to enrich and exalt us." We are always ready to listen to some sort of profound, difficult solution which requires all our strength, but the simple easy way of faith and of letting God help us in his own way we refuse to accept.

According to the text, impurity of heart keeps us from seeing God or letting him enter our lives. What is impurity of heart? Not that we are sinners, we shall never cease entirely to be sinners; but that in our sins "we will not permit ourselves to be helped by him who

alone can free, help, deliver, in short, who can *forgive*." Before we can become colaborers or partners with God we must have the assurance and joy, of forgiveness. Then the heart is pure *through faith*, then we shall see God and God will become our helper, our refuge, our victory.

We shall not see God "through stirring up religious experiences and emotions, through rites and services, through submersion and exaltation of ourselves"; and, I assume that if pressed to do so, Barth would add, not through social research or science and philosophy. "It is only through distress, dilemma, and need of help into which one sinks deeper and deeper that we become thoroughly pure of heart and see him."

What shall we do? Palmer answers: "Use your lives as a great creative adventure with God. . . . This is the call of religion to the souls of men today." Barth answers: "This need [of purity of heart] becomes the supreme virtue that just the afflicted, the heavy laden are called blessed; that the publicans and Job came out of their sins and miseries justified; that the blind see, the lame walk, the deaf hear, and the dead rise up, this is the miracle; this comes from God, this is effected through God's word."

God and Man

Barth is convinced that, before man can see God and receive God's help, God must do something for him through Christ, that is, *forgive him;* and man must believe in God's forgiveness and believing must obey the word of God that is spoken to him directly through the scriptures. The end of the Christian life, of God's revelation, of Christ's life, death, resurrection, and mediatorial reign, is the kingdom of God in which death is overcome and in which there is a fellowship of men and women continually living in the spirit of love and justice as revealed in Jesus Christ who is Savior and Lord.

Palmer seeks access to God through the cosmic and human processes by investigation and by cooperation with that for which God works in the world—justice, beauty, love, brotherhood. Palmer takes for granted that man is capable of finding God, without special revelation, through the cosmic order in the large and in the small. Palmer puts primary emphasis on *man's activity with God* for men; then only will God work with man and reveal himself to him. Barth puts primary emphasis on *God's activity for men;* then only is man able to see God and to work with him. Both emphasize the present activity of God and man's dependence on him.

Here are two types of interpretation of Christianity—the one proceeds from man and the universe to God; the other proceeds from God in Christ to man and the universe; the one appears to be primarily concerned about man's dignity, the other about God's sovereignty, in living the Christian life.

Christian Century.

Confessions of a Barthian Translator

Dr. E. G. Homrighausen

Perhaps this confession is an exaggerated case of "Barthianistis" on my part,—but I doubt it. I think my experience is that of Dr. Richards and Dr. Ernst. But to me, to whom it has been given to make accessible to English readers the living faith of Barth and Thurneysen, has come a remarkably thrilling and transforming experience. This little part I have had in translating and interpreting this dynamic movement, inaugurated by the mysterious Providence of God, is not only a joy, but an epochal, personal change of life and outlook.

The chief burden of this confession has to do with long and tedious days spent pondering over these hot and living words and sentences and phrases, until the elemental faith was caught. It has to do with the transferring of these flaming and dazzling ultimates into a readable English. This may seem a simple task. But we have to do in these sermons not with cool theological reasoning. We have to do here with preaching. And preaching is the very problem out of which so-called "Barthianism" arose. For preaching is where God lives as an Object spoken about. It is never a discourse about God as a subject of discussion. It is never argument—it is the presentation of God as the Great Positive *I am!* Preaching—not dogmatics—is where a man gives witness to his inmost, positive faith—his personal convictions.

That is why this work of translating was not a simple task. It was such as to grip my soul, pick me up, shake me, examine me. It has made profound changes in my soul. One had to become a disciple of his master, he had to live through every thought and word of his preaching. He had to identify himself with the throbbing faith-life of Thurneysen and Barth and their terrific struggles, out of which have come these sermons and their speech about Reality that has had such power and sincerity as to change the course of Western theological thinking. In the translation of these sermons I had to do, not with words and sentences merely, but with men who desperately had fought and prayed and sweated their way through to a living grasp of Reality that all men recognized to be unique.

This volume, "Come Holy Spirit," contains single sermons that are enough to change a man's whole ministry, some that will make him lay aside every other book and set him to wandering and wondering out in the great open spaces, some that will paralyze his petty Church duties for days and weeks, some that will make him feel the sting of remorse, some that will plunge him into the depths of despair. Some of these sermons will make him want to run away from his ministry, to cry to high heaven for forgiveness for wasted years of misdirected efforts. Some will make him want to hie away to the nearest closet to pray like a child. Some will make his sermon for the following Sunday as so much chaff in his sight. Some will make him face his congregation with a new will-to-penitence that will be the foundation of a new personality, marked by one characteristic: *absolute sincerity.* Some will make him smite his breast in abject prodigality of spirit.

If my experience is any clue to what these sermons can do, they will, in the reading, make one feel as though his whole existence were gripped by a strange and mysterious Enemy—and Friend. One will feel as if he were desperately alone with God,—the First, Last and Living One. One will see that there is but one problem to the whole of life and the world,—that problem is GOD. One will feel the reality of Jesus Christ, not as a mere prophet, but as the One among all men to Whom it has been given to reveal the heights and the depths of both God and man. For Jesus Christ and God will be one and the same.

In these sermons I have felt every last rational argument for God and salvation slip from my grasp until I have stood naked and alone before the God of my salvation. I have seen that, after all, God is nearest those who have surrendered all, who do not seek to save themselves. How it did smite my pride—to feel again the thrill of a salvation that came entirely of grace and of mercy—to admit that my only hope for salvation is a trusting and believing heart.

No one can read the sermon, "Jesus Is Victor," without asking God for forgiveness for the many Easter sermons he has preached which after all never proclaimed the real message of the resurrection from the dead. Every last argument for the possibility of immortality fades into a mere weak hope,—unless God raises men from the dead! Oh, the terrible reality—the defeat—of death! It is the shut door which *no man* opens!

Here stewardship is preached! The stewardship that is born of surrendering faith. Barth says that, if we really believed the first sentence of the 24th Psalm, we would have all the divine help we needed, a creed to safety live by, namely, that "the earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof, the world and they that dwell therein." In these sermons we feel that man simply possesses nothing that is not the gift of Another. Confession of that dependence in obedient faith is the very essence of the Christian faith.

No one can read the sermon on the "Freedom of the Word of God" and not feel guilty for the way in which we have *used* God as we would a commodity, merchandising Him as an economic good! God must not be used; He is to be worshipped He must be free, and no man dare enslave Him. To do so is the arch sin of man, who will not that God be his Lord. When God is free again—to be God, we shall have a glorious era of the Church. How this truth smashes our petty dogmatisms, our human systems, every bit of our false pride—it makes us all brothers in mercy, because God *alone* is right and true. What a word for Christian unity!

No one can read the sermon, "Jesus and Nicodemus," without seeing the futility of all our intellectual religious discussions to get at God's Reality. The religious teacher coming to Jesus by night—ah, that represents many of us!—seeking a religious *talk*. But with one rash stroke Jesus strikes the cards from his consultant's hand and faces him with the raw realities of realistic decision if he would enter the spiritual life! To translate that sermon must indeed have been an experience which sent chill and thrill through the translator's soul.

To see Jesus demanding reality, not talk, is to see Him in His rugged reality, the only Jesus that can face this age with ultimates from which no living soul can escape!

My experience is still vivid of how, time and again, I had to walk around with a soul full of burning experience as I translated the sermon on "Jesus and Judas." Never had Judas been so close to me. Never had I seen Judas in that light. I felt as if I was gripped in soul, as though Another Whom I could not escape nor contradict was facing me with the only issue of life. The translation of that sermon was the most trying thing I have ever done. I was driven into the last corner. I saw my ministry and life sweep before me as when one faces a serious accident. I was in an existential moment, where all arguments fail, where alibis no longer count. I was faced with the pure reality of myself and of God. I felt myself attacked by One Who left me no harbor until I surrendered all. And what I thought was absolute annihilation of every human value, loss of every human support, was only the evil imagination of my mind, my old doubt, for in surrendering all I found the only support that can remain in all eternity—the living God! The words of Nietszche, which form the first sentence of that sermon, still ring in my mind, "Man is something that must be overcome!" The ultimate, last ego must be stormed. It must give up wholly to Christ the Enemy, Who is yet the rightful Friend. How ashamed I felt that my Gospel so often only skimmed the surface of man, only sought to make him respectable, "reformed" or Reformed, but it did not go deep enough. Even my social Gospel was a poor makeshift of a panacea, which only touched the fringe of human life. War, liquor, and all the other powers of hell would have no power if the human ego did not give them their power. The Gospel, Jesus Christ, aims to get that central ego in control, to capture it. That is Christian social reconstruction. And I felt ashamed of my weak and smooth words to men, when what they must have is the bitter truth that comforts even as it accuses. How much time I had wasted by absorbing myself in lesser matters, when the Church should be doing the bigger thing—storming the ego of man, winning that *self* for the True Friend.

I am convinced that in these sermons we face the true Reality that is at the basis of our present world, and that in them one may feel the pulse of the only Power by which we will, and must, be saved, if at all. If the Church and the Christian ministry would really catch the glow of faith expressed in these utterances, it will be possessive of a foundation and a leadership which can lead the world into a new era. But we must first of all be gripped with the truth that we possess the ultimates, in a living faith.

I may be guilty of exaggeration, but I think we three translators feel agreed upon these conclusions, or we would never have gone to the trouble involved in this labor. Let our names be forgotten, let Barth and Thurneysen fade from the picture. But when you lay down this live coal of witness, you will feel that a new vision has swum into your ken, a vigorous faith has challenged your doubt, a desperate

optimism has called you out of your gloom. The living, eternal God will have dawned anew on your soul.

After reading you will not see any man. (Barth and Thurneysen have not attached their names to any of these sermons for that reason.) But, only the splendor of the incomprehensible glory of God will accuse, dazzle, warm, cheer and draw you, and your prayer will be, "*Come, Holy Spirit.*" The supreme quality of man will be yours: Humility—the open, inviting, trusting, brotherly heart. That is Christ!

This confession must not close without saying that in these sermons will be found the cure for the Church's ills! Not by trying to save herself as such, but by being again absolutely true to the God Who gave her birth in Jesus Christ, can she be saved. *There is no other way!* But until God returns (not the hazy and nebulous God of naturalism, but the living, ethical personal God Who is the only and the primary Reality of life and the world) there is little hope for recovery. The awful, the holy, the living God has come closer through these sermons,—the God with Whom we have always and forever to do. Only by sensing the infinity and farness of God can we ever hope to appreciate His nearness to us in Christ Jesus. Only by feeling again His terror and His power and His judgment, can we ever hope to appreciate again His loving-kindness, His tenderness, and His forgiving salvation. Here we sense the thunder and the storm and the earthquake, but in that background we hear the still, small voice, we see Immanuel, we know the Spirit of His presence in our quiet hearts!

Preaching will come back! But,—it must be *preaching*, witnessing, selfless presentation of God. Who is equal to such a task? "How long, O Lord, how long?" No preacher will mount his pulpit casually after reading a few of these sermons!

Indianapolis, Ind.

Reformed Church Messenger.

Albert Schweitzer

Julius Seelye Bixler

The name of Albert Schweitzer is one which suggests above all else versatility of achievement. No other member of our geenration has done so much in many different fields and done it so well. Yet Schweitzer's accomplishments are not those of a restless extrovert busy with many things because of an inability to concentrate on the few that are important. They suggest rather a sensitiveness to the far-reaching ramifications of a central problem and a willingness to follow any path, however arduous, which may lead to its answer. Schweitzer's energies have not been scattered. They have been organized by one idea. His life, as an expression of that idea, is a synthesis such as few mortals attain. It was no accident that in 1928 at the city of Frankfort he was awarded the Goethe prize, for, although his work has not included the writing of poetry, his life, in its harmony and proportion, is itself a poem.

The idea in which Schweitzer's life centers is that of the meaning of obligation and of the reverence and loyalty which an ideal of obligation should inspire. He does not tell us so specifically, but it is plain from his life and his work that he regards the problem as insoluble on strictly intellectual grounds. Indeed, he says directly that there is no philosophical argument against pessimism and no final answer for the problem of evil. "Only at rare moments," he writes, "am I glad to be alive." Knowledge cannot reach an optimistic conclusion. For this one must look to one's will and one's hope. The situation is aggravated for Schweitzer by the fact that he refuses to bow to any principle which does not come with the force of an absolute demand. Perfectionism is characteristic of his work throughout, in the sense that he cannot rest satisfied with a goal for thought and action except one which is uncompromising in its claim. This quality he does not find in the various social philosophies and utilitarianisms, in spite of their supposed rational basis. Nor does he see it in appeals to "nature" as an authority. Again, although he believes in the right of the individual personality to its own self-development, he will not admit the plea of some thinkers that such development should be carried on in indifference to the demands of society as a whole. The passive resignation of the East he rejects because of its color-blind neutrality on moral issues. At the same time he holds that the West has been shallow in its acceptance of a facile optimism. Mysticism as usually practised has meant a denial of certain obvious goods, but he would retain a certain mystical quality in our attitude to the mysterious. Above all, suffering cries out to be relieved, yet we find neither in nature nor in society an adequate answer to the question why suffering is here or why the heart should reject the answers which the head supplies.

Schweitzer declines to accept the solutions offered by the great minds of history. Plato's ethics he finds too negative and too indifferent to the busy world of affairs. In Aristotle the theoretical basis of ethics is insufficiently clear. Spinoza plunges us ultimately into a nature-philosophy with the lack, common to nature philosophies, of a satisfactory criterion of value. The utilitarians lose sight of the necessary self-fulfillment of the individual. Kant sees the importance of this, but his moral imperative has no content, and his appeal to epistemology has put philosophy on the wrong track. Hegel gives us an *a priori* ethic instead of one based on living realities. Nietzsche emphasized the natural at the expense of the spiritual. The great German, British, and American post-Kantians are correct in their stress on the need for a higher "life-affirmation," but they fail to show how it is to be realized in a hostile world, and they do not throw light on the fundamental problem of how an ethic of self-sacrifice is to be combined effectively with the will-to-live from which it must originally have sprung.

Where then shall we turn? Schweitzer tells us that after many hours of concentration on the problem the answer flashed upon him as he was bound on an errand of mercy which took him into the heart

of the African jungle. The formula which meets the difficulties is that of "reverence for life." In reverence for life we come face to face with that which is intrinsic to our own nature as living beings. We cannot deny our will to live. Its voice is the most authoritative of any that we know. At the same time its claim is that of value and conscience as well as of existence. If we look at the outside world we see only sporadic indications of purpose, while on account of our own situation as human beings we find it impossible to rid ourselves of our narrow prejudices in favor of those purposes which are on the side of humanity. But in our own will to live we discover a purpose which animates the entire world as we see it, and which can be developed through reflection into an all-embracing good.

To the obvious criticism that reverence for life offers no way of distinguishing between good life and bad, the life of sacrifice, including the sacrifice of one's self, and that of indiscriminate support of all living processes, Schweitzer has an answer. Implicit in reverence for life is, he claims, a principle of development, which carries us through an attitude of world-resignation, with its fulfillment of certain inner tendencies to perfection, out to an ethic of affirmation, where we see that our own will to live is an expression of a will operating in all life. This leads to a realization of the fact that the highest life demands quality in itself and stands ready to sacrifice its own pleasure if this will bring a higher value to life in general. Jesus' example shows how the passive and active features can be combined. Life must be sacrificed at times, as when plants and animals are sacrificed for human good. But the judgments which we all have to make on these matters should not be taken lightly. They involve a heavy responsibility. That we have to make them is part of the ultimate mystery, but a part which we must accept and turn as we can to spiritual ends. Through reflection on the bitterness of destruction, as through sacrifice of myself to those who need me, I can begin to realize the meaning of life's demands. "I am life which wills to live and I live in the midst of life which wills to live"—this is the fundamental maxim of our experience, and a means toward understanding the best that it contains. We have but to work out its meaning to arrive at a view of the world and of our place in it which undergirds our will to love as well as our will to live, and which summons us to realize the dignity of personality latent in us through an acceptance of the claim which all life lays upon us. Our knowledge of God himself goes back to the fact that we experience him in our will to live.

One would have to go far to find a writer whose deeds so eloquently supplement his words. If Schweitzer's written argument at places falters, we have only to turn to his life to find revealed the meaning of his deepest insights. Before he achieved world renown Schweitzer was a popular preacher, pastor, and professor of theology at the University of Strasbourg in Alsace. He had studied the organ with Widor at Paris, become an acceptable public recitalist, written a standard life of Bach, and produced philosophical studies in addition to some theological works which were gaining in influence and power. On reading a plea

for the establishment of a hospital in an African mission station he determined, with a decisiveness which his wife tells us has characterized all his activity, to become a medical missionary. A doctorate in medicine was added to those he had already taken in philosophy and theology, and he sailed with his wife for equatorial Africa, to build, largely with his own hands, a hospital in Lambarene. Interned during the war, he saw his work fall to pieces. Afterward by lectures and recitals in Sweden he gained money to build up again, attracting medical men from Europe who through their research have now isolated the germ of one of the worst tropical diseases, adding this scientific and philanthropic achievement to the list with which this human giant must be credited.

Schweitzer is a large man, physiclly as well as spiritually. With his great frame, his commanding presence, shaggy head of hair, prominent muscles, penetrating eyes and directness of manner, he impresses one as a champion of humanity fit to wrestle with nature or with the problems of the intellect as with the forces of evil. In a conversation which it was my privilege to have with him I was eager to discover which among his many interests—intellectual, esthetic, and philanthropic —loomed the largest in his own mind, and where, if at all, they met in a common focus. It seemed to me that he talked more than anything else of the supreme need, especially for workers in religion, of absolute devotion to abstract truth. He referred at times bitterly to the harm done by disregard of truth, and to the incalculable effects of the wilful deception practised on both sides in the war. As he talked, it seemed to me that the dominating conception of his life became increasingly clear. Devotion to truth is for him the highest manifestation of the will to live, the form which realizes the largest ethical possibilities, since it forces men to choose among the products of life, and does so with a rigidity which brooks no denial. Everything about Schweitzer shows the power of this idea. When you hear him play Bach it is no longer Schweitzer who plays, and no longer Bach as an individual who is being interpreted. You stand rather in the presence of the eternal forms of beauty, and listen to their direct appeal. When Schweitzer wrote his great work on the life of Jesus the same principle was manifest. He refused in this book to compromise with any desire for comfort or with any impulse to conform to accepted views, but recognized the claims of exact scholarship as paramount, and presented a view which was radical both in that it was new and also in that it went to the roots of the problem. Finally, when he gave up a brilliant career in Europe to bring to the illiterate African native the fruits of science for human welfare he showed anew the rigor of the demands made by the will to live when it has grown conscious of its own inner meaning and has become aware of the dignity to which it can attain by absolute devotion to its sense for what is true.—*The Christian Leader.*

Steer Clear of This

A number of readers have asked the *Messenger's* opinion about the *Goodwin Plan* and similar money-making schemes contrived to link up our Churches with financial institutions and organizations so as to enable them to assist in supporting themselves without direct giving on the part of the people. As a matter of fact, the MESSENGER has often expressed itself along this line in the clearest possible fashion. We think it is always unfortunate and never desirable for a Christian congregation, which is supposedly a spiritual institution, designed to do spiritual work by the use of spiritual and not carnal methods, to link itself up with any organization, no matter how honorable, which offers to help Church finances through some arrangement to *give commissions* in return for activity in *promoting the sale of various articles*, or to provide a commission if certain articles are purchased in accordance with the proposed plan. We realize that, especially in times like these, when some Church organizations are driven almost to desperation in order to make ends meet, there is a disposition to *grasp at any straw* that is thrown in their general direction, but how can any one regard it as edifying for the First Reformed Church of Penobscot, for instance, to try to induce its members and friends to use Roly-Poly Tooth Paste in preference to all other makes of tooth paste because, with the sale of Roly-Poly, the congregation will get a commission that will help it to carry on its religious work?

Attention has been called to the *unfairness toward other legitimate business* interest which is always ivolved in such a commercial compact between a Church and a business organization. The *Congregationalist* uses this excellent illustration: "Take the case of a dealer in automobiles who is a sincere Churchman, who has joined his Church and supports it not from any mercenary interest or from the hope of selling automobiles, but from the sheer standpoint of Christian experience and convictions. Suppose some organization in his congregation adopts the plan by which the sale of some other make of automobile is effected in the congregation with the understanding that a part of the sale price should go to the Church. The automobile dealer who is trying to make a legitimate living doing business in his community would have, it seems to us, just grounds of complaint upon two scores: First, that his legitimate business was being subjected to an unfair form of competition by competitors who were availing themselves of a non-profit religious organization for their own commercial advantage; and secondly, that the Church itself was being commercialized in an unidealistic way."

We are convinced that a lot of Churches are making a great mistake in the effort to support themselves by any methods of this sort. If there is not enough love and loyalty among the people to support the Church by straight-forward giving, it would be better in some cases for the congregation to die. The profit motive is behind all such schemes, and there is grave peril in every commercial undertaking of this kind. We think the *Christian Century* deserves much credit for taking high ground in this matter, and it is difficult for us to believe

that even the high-powered and attractive advertising matter issued in the interest of such schemes, together with the use of some honorable names, can long deceive the great majority of our Church people. Most congregations will refuse to be used by any commercial organization in such a questionable experiment. Even if in some cases the use of such a plan might be justified as a last resort, it should be generally admitted that it can only be justified because so many professing Christians have failed to reach the level of Christian vision and devotion, which personal stewardship and Scriptural guidance are bound to establish.

It is well known that Church papers are in grave financial peril, and one of the reasons is the small income from advertising. There is reason to believe that this income could be considerably increased if we supported such commercial alliances as are referred to above. Indeed, this assurance has been pictured in glowing terms by promoters. But it is the duty and privilege of the Church to support its journals, and they should not be permitted to be subsidized by outsiders who have an axe to grind.

Book Review

NOTE—*Reviews, when not signed, are by the editor.*
(When ordering books, please mention the Magazine.)

The Nature of Religion, by *Geo. Wobbermin* (University of Goettingen). Translated by Theo. Menzel, Eden Theological Seminary and Daniel Sommer Robinson, Indiana University. With an Introduction by Douglas Clyde MacIntosh, Yale University. Thomas Y. Crowell Comp. Publishers, New York, 1933. 379 pages, $3.50.

Professors Menzel and Robinson deserve our thanks for making Wobbermin's book on the Nature of Religion available to us in an English translation. Wobbermin, filling the chair once held by the late Ritschl at Goettingen University, is known and noted as one of the first authorities on Schleiermacher and as the founder of the religio-psychological method in the study of religion. He was a personal friend of W. James, the great American psychologist, and translated his "Varieties of Religious Experience" into German. But while he owed much to James and his epoch-making work, he owed still more to the great German theologian, who is by general consent called the father of modern theology. It was Schleiermacher himself, who introduced the psychological viewpoint into the treatment of religion. His chief work is the "Glaubenslehre" (the doctrine of the Christian faith). Theologians before him had considered theology as the science of God, doctrina de Deo. Their start was from God, objectively, and their material they got from the Bible direct. Schleiermacher started from man, the religious man, and he got his religious material from the Christian consciousness of the individual and of the religious community. It is this fact, more than anything else, that explained the reaction from Schleiermacher that has set in in our time. Schaeder, in his "Theocentric Religion", blames Schleiermacher for making the study of theology anthropocentric, because he based it on the ego-feeling. And every one knows with what vigor Barth and his followers reject the whole movement inaugurated by Schleiermacher. Instead of making the believing subject the source from which they draw their description of the faith, they put in its place, objectively and emphatically, the Word of God.

Wobbermin, however, stoutly raises the war-cry: Back to Schleiermacher! Schleiermacher's definition of religion as the *feeling of absolute dependence* is still valid, although in need of being supplemented. He says, "The nature of religion is to be found in the relationship of man to an 'over-world' in which he believes and which he intuits by faith and upon which he feels himself dependent". In another place he says, "This relationship to the over-world reflects itself in the feeling

of dependence, of security and of ardent yearning". Wobbermin does well in claiming that religion is a matter of personal experience. He goes too far, though, when he makes the further declaration that statements of belief are verbal expressions of the emotional states of feeling of the pious; for the beliefs, the creeds of the Christian Church, cannot by any means simply be read off from the emotional record of the pious. This seems to be an equally fruitless attempt as was the effort of the Erlanger "Erfahrungs" theologians to reproduce the Lutheran dogmatic system from the religious experiences of the believer.

After Wobbermin has adopted and worked over Schleiermacher's definition of religion, he tests it by a careful observation of the religious life of the non-Christian religions, the primitive as well as the great national religions. He does not, in this volume, apply his theory of religion to Christianity and its history. This finds its presentation in volume III of his Systematic Theology, entitled: "Das Wesen und die Wahrheit des Christentums". The study of the non-Christian religions, contained in the book before us, offers much valuable material, especially his original contribution on the religious life of Australian primitives.

In his opinion the psychological research into, and interpretation of, the non-Christian religions brings more assured results than the genetic method (the investigation of its origin) or the religio-historical one (which tries to discover the nature of religion by comparing historical religions). He also objects to a third method, that of treating the Christian religion as the only true one and judging the value of other religions according to the degree of their approach to Christianity. From the point of view of the scientific investigation of religion, this would signify a begging of the question, he says. Wobbermin, therefore, is diametrically opposed to the Barthian standpoint, according to which Christianity is treated as so much in a class by itself, that it is not a religion at all. This seems to Wobbermin not an extravagance only, but an absurdity. We grant that it is a statement that is likely to be misunderstood, but it possibly means no more than that Christianity is the only true religion, so much above any other that it is not only different from them in degree, but in kind.

In the second part of the book Wobbermin deals with the question of the truth of religion (of religion in general, not of the Christian religion in particular). Is the "over-world" of which it tells real or not? Can a religious world-view maintain itself over against the denials of the agnostic, the materialist, the evolutionist, etc.? For Wobbermin, although a disciple of Ritschl and his school, is not satisfied with the Ritschlian "value" judgments, which exclude "theoretical" considerations and tell us to be satisfied with what the Christian religion means to our own faith. He blames Ritschl for allowing just enough philosophy in his system to get rid of it (of philosophy). "Theology", he says, "must come out into the arena of metaphysical discussion and make good its claim to being rationally permissible as well as practically valid". So in the second part, he meets the foes of the truth of religion valiantly: Feuerbach e. g. with his illusionism (the gods

are created by man to satisfy his needs, to protect his interests and realize his ideals). Of course, he agrees with Kant that we do not possess rational knowledge of the supersensual, we cannot comprehend it by the theoretical reason. We cannot demonstrate that there is a God or a hereafter. We can only try to show the reasonableness of such faith. In speaking of the natural sciences and of the evolutionary theory in particular, he gratefully takes notice of the fact that crass materialism is on the wane and that leading scientists are inclined to believe that a spiritual interpretation of the universe is the only reasonable one (Whitehead, Millikan and Jeans we would mention here). Wobbermin finally reaches the result that religion occupies the supreme place in the spiritual life, that it is the mother of all culture. Goethe's well known word might have been quoted by the author, that the periods of faith have always been the most creative and the periods of unbelief the most barren in human history. Another word of the great poet he does quote: "The most beautiful happiness of thinking men comes from fathoming the fathomable and from quietly reverencing the unfathomable".

As was said above, the question of the truth of the Christian religion is not discussed in this volume. It seems hard to detach that entirely from the field of research. But then the author gives so much otherwise. He discusses Christian Science, Theosophy, Vaihinger's philosophy of "as if", the Freudian theory, mysticism, etc., that we can well afford to be contented.

The translators merit our greatest admiration. Their work seems perfect to this reviewer. We haven't found a line where the fact that it is a translation obtrudes itself on the reader. What a task it was to translate a book of such a size and character into the English idiom, what skill and what perseverance it required! The reader may differ here and there from the position of the author, and would perhaps differ still more if he came to vol. III ("Wesen und Wahrheit des Christentums") but it will be impossible for him to follow into his arguments and possess himself of his information without being benefited by it.

Christianity, by *Edw. Bevan*, LL.D., Lecturer on Hellenistic History and Literature, King's College, London. New York, H. Holt and Comp., 1932. 240 pages, $1.25.

In this volume (No. 146 of the "Home University Library of Modern Knowledge") the author surveys the development of the Christian Church from the beginning to the present day. We shall try to accompany the writer on his way and select for comment whatever seems to call forth such as we go along.

The apostle Paul is naturally given the chief credit in the movement of the Christian religion from Israel to the heathen world. Today our liberal writers in presenting Jesus to their readers, depict him mainly as the one who reveals God ("God is like Jesus"). Not so Paul. His letters contain little of the teachings of Jesus or of references to

his earthly life. To him what Jesus was and did is more important that what he said and taught. Jesus is not another teacher only. He is the Lord and Savior. The gospel of Jesus is the story of his dying and rising for man. The Cross is more important than the Sermon on the Mount. Teachings and morals have, of course, their place, but in the foreground stands God who revealed his forgiving love to man in the sacrifice of his son. This is the source out of which the new life and faith and love of the Christian springs forth.

Aside from the gospel in this form, the social life of the Christian accounts for the attraction the pagan world found in Christianity. They knew the ideal their own philosophers had pictured of the good life, but here the ideal became realized in a miscellaneous multitude drawn from all walks of life.

When the Church became the state religion of the Roman Empire, the hardening process in belief and administration that had already set in, became more pronounced. In formal creeds the Church pronounced what it deemed necessary to believe of God's revelation and man's salvation. Furthermore, a hierarchy of ecclesiastical officials was evolved, of whom the bishop of Rome soon became the leading member and head. As the Roman political empire fell into decay the power and prominence of the Church and the influence of its leading bishop took the place that once had been filled by the emperor.

The question is asked why the Church when its power became almost irresistible, never reformed the institution of society, why slavery, war, oppression on a large scale, continued under Christianity as it had been under the old Rome. The answer is that the Church saw its chief objects in preparing man for a heavenly world. This ideal was so high and over-powering that the idea of making over the old institutions of this world never came to be seriously considered. Of course, the Church did a lot of good in teaching and practising philanthropy, in mitigating the evils that existed. Still it did not change the institutions of the world. It did create little social islands where the ideal Christian life could be carried on, in the secluded world of monasticism.

It's the author's position never to take an absolute stand either on the side of Catholicism or Protestantism. He sees and acknowledges good and evil wherever it is found. The medieval world with its missionary activity, its great cathedrals, its scholastic teachers, its great personalities (Bernhard of Clairvaux, St. Francis, Thomas Aquinas, etc.) evokes his admiration justly. But there is also another side, the "dark ages", the corruption of morals, the immoral and criminal popes, the need of reform and the killing of the reformers.

This mediating attitude is especially unsatisfactory in his treatment of the Reformation. He calls it the most momentous event since the conversion of Emperor Constantine. But he tries then to show that Catholics and Protestants are not so far apart after all. The latter accepted most of the Catholic beliefs, he says, they differed only in certain minor things, like worship of saints and of Mary; the mass; in the matter of vestments and crucifixes. The Protestants tried to

restore the original simplicity of the Christian worship and system; and they used the Word of God as the supreme standard of life and faith. Yes, says the writer, but whence do we get the Bible? It's the Church that gave us the Bible, and now the Protestants appeal to the Bible against the Church and want to reform the Church according to the Bible. Is it not a vicious circle in which they find themselves trapped and reduced to absurdity? Very poor reasoning, we think. The Church didn't produce the Bible or the New Testament. The New Testament was written by apostles and apostolic men who guided by the Spirit wrote the story of Christ and the Church he founded. This story was then taken over by the Church and handed down to the coming generations as containing the standard of the faith and life of the Church for all future time. The Church thereby declared that her own faith and life was to be judged by it consistently. If she deviated from it it was her duty to reform her teaching and conduct in accordance with it. Whenever she had failed to reform in the past God had chosen men actuated by his Spirit who called her to repentance. The prophets in Israel performed such service under the old dispensation; and all through her history there had been such prophetic or apostolic voices. The Reformers of the sixteenth century certainly were in the line of the prophets and apostles. The Church would not hear their testimony. She refused to reform, even as Israel had refused to listen to the prophets, or, later, to the voice of the men who preached to her the gospel. As the apostles were justified to turn from unrepentant Israel to the Gentiles, so the Reformers were justified in leaving unrepentant Rome to herself and building their Church on the old foundations.

It is true, by doing so they introduced division into the Church, and as a later result there was a multiplicity of Churches. But it is better to sacrifice unity than truth, although history shows that a divided Church loses much of her strength of appeal and seems to indicate that search for the truth is futile.

The book has its limitations but it is a good presentation of the main movements in Christianity. Only the Social Gospel has been overlooked. It is the product of a well-informed and skilful writer, thought-provoking and in most respects thoroughly satisfactory.

Contemporary American Theology. Theological Autobiographies edited by *Vergilius Ferm* (Professor of Philosophy, The College of Wooster, Wooster, Ohio). Second Series. Round Table Press, Inc., New York, 1933. 376 pages, $3.00.

In this Second Series the editor presents to us eleven American theologians (in addition to the twelve in the First Series) who are telling us the stories of their religious and theological pilgrimage. They represent a cross-section of the religious thought of the time. They differ considerably in their theology but nearly all belong to the liberal school. They accept the results of the criticism of the Bible. Christianity as a "Way of Life" seems to them more significant than

as a system of beliefs, and values they consider more akin to the religious spirit than facts. There is to be noticed in modern liberalism an eager quest for certainty. On the other hand, liberalism is characterized by a disinclination to recognize absolutes. Even the idea of God is affected by it. They may not call him a finite God but he is conditioned by circumstances not of his own making. No external authority is regarded as final, not even that of Jesus. The facts of his life, his miracles, his resurrection, his deity may probably be true but they are religiously unessential. In all these things we are told to maintain an attitude of "open-mindedness", a scientific poise, which tells us to treat beliefs and convictions as tentative, to wait for further light and not to expect finality as long as we are in this vale of mortality. It is no wonder, therefore, that the certainty so devoutly sought eludes man's grasp again and again.

The first man on the list is Professor *Edward Scribner Ames* of the University of Chicago, a liberal of the liberals. He says, "Protestantism is feeling its own dissolution under the influence of modernism. Historical criticism of the Scriptures, scientific demolition of its cosmogony, and the secularization of all values through the industrial revolution and its effects leave the traditional forms of religion archaic and exhausted."

Ames has been the pastor of a church for many years. As a free church, he says, it can have no creed. The only parts of the Apostolic creeds that he would care to subscribe to are the declarations that Jesus suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead and buried. All the rest are assertions beyond the realms of verifiable fact.

"Christianity now faces the alternative of becoming a religion of this world or of having no appeal to this age."

Coming to the second man on the list, *John Baillie*, Roosevelt Professor of Systematic Theology in Union Theological Seminary, New New York City, we get in touch with an entirely different man. He terms his article "Confessions of a Transplanted Scot", for he was born in the Scottish Highlands, reared in a deeply religious atmosphere. Even if he later came under entirely different influences, the convictions of his early youth remained with him through life. He studied in Edinburgh University, owed much to the philosophical training under Pringle-Pattison. Later he spent several summer semesters in Germany, mostly in Marburg, where he sat at the feet of W. Herrmann, the great Ritschlian. But he also drank deeply of the Kant-Schleiermacher tradition. Although he did not agree with the latter that religion was a feeling, he was stoutly persuaded that the religious experience which we get by faith is a reliable approach to ultimate Reality. He says it is still quite customary in American seminaries to claim that faith is for the uneducated individual a tolerable contact with the religious verities, but that this stage of intuition is to be followed by the higher one of intellectual argumentation, just as though Kant had never lived. "No indeed," he says, "religious faith is not a dim fore-grasping of a reality which other and exacter processes of thought and research will afterwards more clearly reveal and more

securely establish, but a way of knowledge which is at least equal to any other in point of reliability and which leads us into the presence of a Reality that is not discoverable by any other means".

We recommend Baillie's interesting autobiography specially to our readers. Also his latest book entitled "The Place of Jesus Christ in Modern Christianity", New York, Scribner's, 1929.

William Adams Brown, Research Professor of Applied Theology in Union Theological Seminary, is well known in American Christianity. He has written quite a number of books, the one on "Beliefs That Matter" being the most recent. Systematic theology is to him not a description of the beliefs held at a certain time but a normative study telling what Christians ought to believe. The creeds, although not to be forced on the minds of men in straight-jacket fashion, contain the substance of what the Church believed at all time. They need restatement as the thought forms and religious needs of the people change from time to time. The Christian religion is that religion which mediates salvation to men better than any other. Jesus is not the crown of natural religion, humanity's highest but natural product. He is the world's savior who reveals God to men. In him we can come to God as directly and closely as the great leaders of the faith in Bible times. Brown has taken a very active part in the special movements within the Church in the last twenty years. His theological views are in accordance with most of ours. He calls himself a Modernist, but in a sense in which most of us are modernists also.

Shailer Mathews, Dean Emeritus of the Chicago University Divinity School; Professor of Historical Theology ("Dogmengeschichte"). Of all the men who have made contributions to this volume, Shailer Mathews is doubtless the most prominent. He is the prince of the Modernists and the number of books he published is legion.

To him Christianity is a "religious social movement, not a body of infallible beliefs." Of course, nobody really would make the statement that Christianity *is* a body of such beliefs, but only that it *has* beliefs that it considers trustworthy. However, Schailer Mathew dissolves most of the doctrines that we consider vital. He describes in this book the story of his spiritual Odyssey very much at length. We cannot go into the details of his wanderings. We shall only say in general that to him the decisions of the Church were functional only, that is they were a method whereby the social mind of a period adapted religion for its own good. He expresses it still more specifically when he says, doctrines are social patterns, analogies drawn from controlling social experiences and ideas which seemed to them who used them not analogies but facts. Some of the results of his way of looking at Christian teachings are as follows: To speak of God as a person and as a loving father is anthropomorphic and is in harmony with the "pattern" of the human family from which it is taken. But God stands for us for the cosmic activities from which personality has sprung. Since personality is the highest category of the evolutionary process there must be personality-producing forces in the universe which are responsible for the process. Jesus Christ is the one who has come

farthest in adapting his life to God. He is to us the matchless example and inspirattion, the way of life as the way to God. Jesus' experience rather than beliefs about his person acquires a revelatory value which becomes a supreme moral ideal. His death shows the power over sin and death of a life perfectly adjusted to God. The stories of miracles have no more claim to acceptance than similar stories found in any literature. Finally, loyalty to Jesus may be expected to survive the shock of chemical and biological changes which we call death.

Other contributions are by *Harris Franklin Rall*, Professor at Garrett Biblical Institute, Northwestern University; *Luther Allan Weigle*, Yale University, and others.

The autobiographical method followed by all men in the book lends to most chapters an intimate charm. At the same time, since the subjects of the sketches are of widely different theological positions the readers get an introduction to the prevailing theological movements which is pleasing as well as instructive.

Issues of Immortality, by *Corliss Lamont*. Ph.D. New York, Henry Holt & Co. 1932. 198 pages, $1.50.

The author of this book does not argue whether there is such a thing as immortality. He tries to clarify the ideas underlying it and point out the implications resulting from it.

There are two conceptions of the soul, he says, which are fundamental. One is that held by Plato. To him the soul is in this life in the prison house of the material body. When death comes the soul is liberated from this bondage and enters into the freedom of the hereafter. Aristotle on the other hand, looks upon the soul and body as belonging together in indissoluble union, like matter and form. This union must be maintained even in death. Aristotle believes in the immortality of man, not only of the soul. Primitive people always suppose the body vital to the soul after death. The Egyptians, even after civilization had been established for long periods, expended the most elaborate care on the preservation of the bodies of the dead, showing that their ultimate hope was in bodily resurrection. The Hebrews were for a long time uninterested in the fate of the body. They even went as far as saying that there was "no device nor knowledge" in the land of the dead; in other words, they believed in the extinction of personality. Their concern was altogether with this world, and their hope that eventually they were to have heaven on this earth. But when their national existence ended in exile their prophets turned their gaze upon the resurrection life.

The Platonic view of immortality seemed to have crowded out the Aristotelian in the classic Greek and Roman world. Still the conception of an immaterial soul surviving after death was so vague and unsatisfactory that we find all attempts at description of the life after death so shaping themselves as though the body was still there. And naturally so, says the writer, for all ideas of immortality if they are to be impressive must have emotional efficacy, imaginative reality and

intellectual acceptability—and this they can't have as disembodied souls.

Christians believed from the beginning, not only in immortality of the soul, but in the resurrection of the body. Resurrection of the *flesh*, the creed had it. In the course of time this was changed to resurrection of the body. The ideas of the hereafter as a heavenly rest or a heavenly Hallelujah chorus have also undergone a change. To us the afterlife includes personal identity, freedom from hampering physical limitations, the power to recognize and communicate with others, love and friendship, a chance to serve and the conservation and increase of the values attained in the earthly life. When we speak of a resurrected *body*, this is to be explained spiritually. It is a mere symbol of our belief that in some way capacity for action and affection is to be preserved.

In a very interesting chapter the author considers the arguments the modern "immortalists" (believers in immortality) advance for their faith. The Church, in old and modern times, has always believed that the great empirical evidence for its faith was given by the resurrection of Christ. Many modern church men, however, find it impossible to believe in such a miracle. Consequently they are looking for arguments in the place of miracles. Their reasonings are in the main reproductions or re-clothings of the Kantian argument. Kant contended that the highest good is to be found in the harmony of virtue and happiness. Virtue is the complete accord between conduct and moral law. Such completeness is not possible in the short span of human life with its great handicaps. Therefore it must be assumed that this life is not all man has at his disposal. An infinite progress towards virtue is made possible only if there is infinity of time to achieve it in. Fichte also declared that this necessity of infinite development was "the seal of the soul's vocation for eternity".

Even one of the contemporary immortalists, Mr. Fosdick, does no more than follow in the footsteps of Kant. He believes with him that personality is the highest value in this world. Its possibilities in knowledge and character are limitless. They require an eternity to become realities. If there is reasonableness in the world there must be an after life to bring the process of love, righteousness and understanding, here begun, to maturity or to permanent development. "The cosmos, whether conceived naturally or super-naturally, must, in order to do what the immortalists want it to do, be a cosmos in which the great human values of goodness, rationality and purpose, supported by socialness, run through the whole creation as a profound and controlling metaphysical motif." The writer wants it understood that all this is an assumption and nothing but an assumption. The argument seems reasonable, but it is not compelling.

The author, in a concluding chapter, discusses the ideas of those who cannot accept the faith in real personal survival and put in its place immortality of influence, or social survival, or eternal life (beginning here and continuing after death). He rightly says that all

these are unsatisfactory and that personal survival in the Aristotelian sense is the only thing that satisfies. The soul-body union as the union of two ultimate entities must be held to continue after death. Only so can the survival of the personality be made to appeal emotionally as well as intellectually.

The author calls upon philosophy to give its whole-hearted attention to this subject and to prove its validity. We hold that this is more than philosophy can ever do. As in the case of the existence of God, only faith will bring assurance. Nevertheless, the book, in its insistence on the application of the soul-body concept to the immortality has steered a safe and steady course.

Talks with Young Parents, by *Nancy Smith Kruskopf.* Eden Publishing House, 1933. 123 pages, $1.25.

Everything in this little volume has previously appeared in magazines. It is now gathered together and put before us in book form. It won't take the reader long to discover that here a person speaks to us about the training of children who has gone through the school of experience. Mrs. Krusekopf, we are told, is the mother of six children, and besides, she is acquainted with the modern pedagogical literature.

As we are glancing through the book our eye falls upon "Obedience and Obstinacy". The writer knows obedience is very desirable, but with leading educators she warns against the policy of getting obedience through frightening a child. The injurious effects of childhood fears sometimes last through life. Nor should parents try to obtain obedience by bribing the child. "What will you give me if I do?" the child will soon say, and perhaps a little later, "You'll have to give me more than that". At times the reader, especially an older one, will disagree with the writer on policies and methods of training. For instance, she is not so much for *unquestioned* obedience; rather, with the modern school, she believes in giving the child a reason for what she expects of them. "Some parents," she says, "may feel that a mother is wrong in never making a request of a child without accompanying it with adequate reason for the desired action, but my observation and experience seems to indicate beyond a doubt that children of all classes and ages are usually reasonable by nature, and it is due to improper handling, impositions and unjust methods that they become otherwise. When once they understand why a thing is to be done, and can be made to see the fairness of it, they are generally willing to cooperate". We say we wouldn't go quite as far as that in explaining, but, then, maybe the old way had its weak points too.

At any rate, Mrs. Krusekopf seems a wise mother and tutor. She draws freely on a rich store of experience. Her illustrations are touching and compelling. Any young parent will do well to get the book and benefit from one who has been a mother six times and added to nature's prompting intelligent thought and the counsel of others.

American Preachers of Today. Intimate Appraisals of Thirty-two Leaders by *Edward DeWitt Jones.* The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Publishers, Indianapolis, 1933. 317 pages, $2.00.

This book calls to mind the other one also reviewed in this issue (page 151), "Contemporary American Theology" by Vergilius Ferm. But while this other one deals with its subjects as theologians, the book before us, now, puts the emphasis on preachers and preaching. The volume by Ferm gives the whole spiritual and theological pilgrimage of the eleven men chosen; ours has to do chiefly with the pulpit power and the way to develop it. An average of ten printed pages is given to each of the thirty-two leaders. It is intensely interesting, and if you have once started with the book it is hard to lay it down. You look for your favorites and you will seldom be disappointed.

The introductory remarks by the author show his intimate acquaintance with the situation. He says our age is one of preaching and of able preachers. To be sure, there are no Henry Ward Beechers, Theodore Parkers, Phillips Brookses, or George Gordons, towering above their preaching brethren, but it is doubtful if there has been another period in American history so opulent in strong and brilliant preachers as our own. The preaching of today is not so obviously serious as that of the fathers, yet modern sermons come to close grips with reality. If the evangelistic note is not heard so often, the ethical and social is strong. In delivery present-day preaching is mostly restrained, conversational, quiet and rarely declamatory.

Our American preaching lacks the painstaking preparation, close thinking and fine expository quality of the preaching of Great Britain and Scotland. Our ministry is not primarily scholarly, nor theological, but it is livelier, more interesting, though it may not be so profound. The richness and versatility of the American pulpit today becomes apparent when one attempts a survey of the field.

Practically every theological view is represented between the covers of the book. The extreme Fundamentalist and the extreme Liberal, the modern and mediating school, the social prophet and the expounder of the great Christian doctrines, the dogmatist and the mystic, the teacher and the poet-preacher—they are all here. The youngest preacher of the group has just turned forty, the oldest seventy-one. Thus the men are for the most part in the ripe maturity of their active ministry, holding responsible positions and in the flood-tide of their intellectual and spiritual power.

The writer begins with *Fosdick*, the pastor of "the most preeminent pulpit of the Christian faith in America, if not the world". As a preacher, he says, he does not remind one of the orator. He has not the beauty of style or the emotional appeal of others. Nevertheless, he exudes vitality. "Dynamic" best describes the man and his preaching. Somebody has said that Dr. Cadman is preaching to people over sixty, Fosdick to those over forty, and Niebuhr to those in their middle twenties. To the question, "How do you prepare your sermons?" he replied: "I choose a subject early in the week, work on it hard, think

about it all I can, write it out in full, draw off an outline of it for Sunday morning, and do as well as I can, talking from the outline". This is not a very specific explanation, but let us here add the statement that for forty years he has been in the habit of devoting five hours every morning to pulpit work. During these hours he must not be disturbed by personal calls, by telephone or in any other way.

Fosdick is to many a radical as to his theological views. Many of his Baptist brethren are afraid of his liberalism, but they have not banished him from their convention platforms.

Merton S. Rice is the second man on the list. He is the pastor of the beautiful Metropolitan Methodist Church of Detroit (cost a million and a half). Here he has an audience of two thousand every Sunday morning. He is burly of build, something of the type physically of Frank W. Gunsaulus or Charles H. Spurgeon. He is decidedly "mid-western" in style and outlook. He is not always in good form, but when he is he captures his hearers completely by his irresistible eloquence. He is a powerful, born preacher. He is the most anecdotal of famed preachers of this generation. He is a master in the use of stories. He picks them up everywhere, some from books, others from his experiences. His church "is vibrant with activity, permeated with enthusiasm, freighted with missionary and evangelistic ardor". Asked what kind of preaching he thought could win in such times as these, he answered: "The preaching of convictions we hold religiously. The pulpit never was a place for mere argument. It is the place for the declaration of conclusions. I do not believe that I have ever faced audiences as hungry for genuine religious preaching as the audiences of this day. Many foundations have been shaken. The great truths of the Christian faith never were more solid".

It is impossible for us to follow the author right along telling what he says about E. F. Tittle, F. F. Shannon, C. R. Brown, B. C. Clausen, C. E. Coughlin (the radio priest), L. H. Hough, C. E. McCartney, W. L. Stidger, H. C. Coffin, S. P. Cadman and many others. We'll only briefly report what he writes about our own *Reinhold Niebuhr*. He is one of the few shining intellectuals among the preachers of America who are both radical and deeply religious. The college students fairly eat up his stuff and then ask for more. This young thinker is keen of mind and he loves to play havoc with the old formulae of religion, the traditional prejudices and particularly conventional piety when it is incarnated in the person of a "captain of industry". He was successful in building up a new church in Detroit. This church (Bethel Evangelical) has never been the same since Niebuhr left it. The worshippers miss the suppressed excitement, the large audiences and the wide-spread interest that were inspired by their leader who had become a national celebrity.

Niebuhr as a speaker would never take a prize in an oratorical contest. He delivery is careless; he "ahs" and "ers" a great deal; and he is powerfully fond of the word "naive", but the man's mind is quick as lightning, his ideas are fertile and fertilizing. He is a student, scholar and very much a philosopher.

Five authors, he says, have helped him greatly:

1. Harnack's "Essence of Christianity."
2. Various books by Carlyle.
3. Troeltsch's "Soziallehren."
4. Schweitzer's "Civilization and Ethics."
5. W. James's "Will to Believe."

Someone has said about him: "He has the freshest mind of any religious teacher among the younger men in America. He can cross swords with the British theologians and the Scotch professors. I have been listening to him for half a dozen years, off and on and I couldn't say that popularity has spoiled him, but I would say that it has not subdued him, nor yet inspired the best within him. He is almost too clever intellectually. A little more tenderness or downright compassion would help to balance his brilliance, and perhaps with the passing years such qualities will be more apparent in his teaching and preaching than they are now. I hope that such will be the case. The temptation of a clever mind is one of the subtlest that a teacher of religion can ever know." With Jones, we "let this stand for what it may be worth".

It would be hard to find a book more interesting to a minister than this one. The reader gets a close-up of all the worthiest in the front rank of American pulpiteers. The author's style is easy and pleasant. And in addition to the pleasure of reading these sketches, there is the inspiration for the active minister to do a little better, to aim a little higher in this business of preaching where these thirty-two men have done so nobly.

The Ordeal of Western Religion, by *Paul Hutchinson.* Houghton, Mifflin Co., Boston and New York, 1933. 139 pages.

Mr. Hutchinson's outlook into the immediate future of Christianity is rather pessimistic. He has told us that in his book on "World Revolution and Religion" that came out several years ago (and was reviewed by us in these pages). In the little volume he offers now he brings the record up to date. It is no less pessimistic, in fact, some have blamed him for the attitude of *defeatism* that he seems so consistently to maintain. However, in his opinion the tension between the Christian Religion on one side and the state, society and the church's own creeds on the other, is on the increase; and there is, he thinks, little religious leadership that understands and meets this tension.

Christianity and the authority of the state clashed in the very first period of its history. The author makes the strange claim that Jesus in his striking word about "God and Caesar" *dodged* the issue and tried to slip out of a complicated problem by an ingenious phrase. Mr. Hutchinson would have done better if he had not made such an impertinent remark. If Jesus had been a dodger at any time and on any subject he would not have been crucified. And his followers, however

meek they might be in other respects, would rather die than give supreme homage to the emperor, the representative of the state. But after Christianity had become the religion of the state, the danger of giving Caesar more than his share was always present. Today the involvement of the Church and the Western states is so complete that Asia and other countries reject its claim to ethical authority. One can see the out-working of this in the changed attitude to missions.

That the churches honor Caesar more than God is especially apparent when war is declared. In the World War all churches became willing agencies for spreading the war fever. Its ministers were the very leaders in the propaganda of hate. Since then they have seen the folly and sinfulness of this and promised never to bless war again. How far this resolve would stand the stress of actual war remains to be seen. Past experiences are not encouraging.

The same critical situation presents itself when we consider the Church's relation to the economic order under which we live. Jesus taught us the supreme value of the individual soul. He said that to gain the whole world would not profit us if we lost our soul. But there is no social system that could continue to function if this idea was seriously entertained. The profit motive is everywhere condemned, but with that also society is condemned that is built on it. None of the great reformers of Protestantism has seen clearly that society must be Christianized as well as the individual. Catholicism also, although it has demanded an improvement of the present social order, has not condemned the profit motive or the class division of society.

The situation assumes a still more menacing aspect when we consider the Church itself and its "changing mental climate" (as the writer expresses it). Here he discusses the Church's attitude towards its creeds. He speaks of the "acids of modernity" that have attacked so fatally the orthodox faith, the very citadel of this faith. Is there a God, what kind of a God, does he care for man? Is Jesus a supernatural being, is he a deity? Is he an authority unquestioned in the moral world, can he be our teacher in reshaping modern society? Is Christianity the only faith that brings salvation, or only one of many, as the writers of Rethinking Missions seem to think? Does the heathen world need any more missionaries, or only social experts, doctors, hospitals, engineers? These are important questions and the answers vary according to a man's position, viewpoint, faith. Attempts are made to harmonize opposing positions as much as possible, to find common ground rather than accentuate differences. But then, between the orthodoxy of the past and the totally different orientation of today there is no real agreement possible. There will be more and more a parting of the ways.

In closing, the author briefly considers the theology of Karl Barth. Barth gives up the faith in the innate goodness of man and expects everything from God. He is so persuaded of the hopelessness of saving society that he wastes no effort on it. On the whole, then, the future outlook is not promising.